arXiv:1611.01892v1 [math.RT] 7 Nov 2016

SEMICLASSICAL ASYMPTOTICS OF $\mathrm{GL}_N(\mathbb{C})$ TENSOR PRODUCTS AND QUANTUM RANDOM MATRICES

BENOÎT COLLINS, JONATHAN NOVAK, AND PIOTR ŚNIADY

ABSTRACT. The Littlewood–Richardson process is a discrete random point process which encodes the isotypic decomposition of tensor products of irreducible rational representations of $\mathrm{GL}_N(\mathbb{C})$. Biane-Perelomov-Popov matrices are a family of quantum random matrices arising as the geometric quantization of random Hermitian matrices with deterministic eigenvalues and uniformly random eigenvectors. As first observed by Biane, correlation functions of certain global observables of the LR process coincide with correlation functions of linear statistics of sums of classically independent BPP matrices, thereby enabling a random matrix approach to the statistical study of $\mathrm{GL}_N(\mathbb{C})$ tensor products. In this paper, we prove an optimal result: classically independent BPP matrices become freely independent in any semiclassical/large-dimension limit. This removes all assumptions on the decay rate of the semiclassical parameter present in previous works, and may be viewed as a maximally robust geometric quantization of Voiculescu's theorem on the asymptotic freeness of independent unitarily invariant random Hermitian matrices. In particular, our work proves and generalizes a conjecture of Bufetov and Gorin, and shows that the mean global asymptotics of $\mathrm{GL}_N(\mathbb{C})$ tensor products are governed by free probability in any and all semiclassical scalings. Our approach extends to global fluctuations, and thus yields a Law of Large Numbers for the LR process valid in all semiclassical scalings.

To Philippe Biane, for his 55th birthday.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22E46 (Primary) 60B20, 46L54, 34L20 (Secondary) .

Key words and phrases. Asymptotic representation theory, representations of general linear groups, random matrix theory, free probability.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 3
1.1. Asymptotic representation theory 3
1.2. Analogy with RMT 4
1.3. Biane–Perelomov–Popov quantization 5
1.4. The semiclassical/large-dimension limit 7
1.5. Mean values and asymptotic freeness 8
1.6. Proof strategy 9
1.7. Higher correlators and higher order freeness 11
1.8. Remarks: BPP observables vs. Newton observables 11
2. Mean Values at the Planck Scale 13
2.1. Unitary invariance 13
2.2. The Weingarten function 14
2.3. Casimirs and Biasimirs 15
2.4. Classical/Quantum decomposition 18
3. Mean Value Asymptotics 20
3.1. The Weingarten function 20
3.2. Quantum asymptotics 22
3.3. Classical asymptotics 24
3.4. Semiclassical asymptotics and freeness 24
4. Covariance of BPP Observables 25
4.1. Covariance setup 25
4.2. 2-point functions at the Planck scale 26
4.3. Covariance asymptotics 32
Acknowledgments 35
References 35
Appendix A. Free Probability Basics 37
Appendix B. Corrected proof of Proposition 2.4 40
Appendix C. BPP Matrices and Geometric Quantization 41
C.1. Toy example 41
C.2. The dual space 41
C.3. Back to the angular momentum 42
C.4. Angular momentum in quantum mechanics 42
C.5. The dual space 43
C.6. Conclusion 44
C.7. Choice of the matrix structure on $\mathfrak{u}(N)^\star$ 44

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Asymptotic representation theory.** Rational representations of the complex general linear group $\mathrm{GL}_N(\mathbb{C})$ were classified by Schur more than a century ago, see e.g. Weyl's classic book [Wey97]. This classification may be stated, albeit in a slightly nonstandard way, as follows: irreducible representations are parametrized, up to isomorphsim, by configurations of N hard particles on the one-dimensional lattice $\mathbb{Z}[\hbar_N]$. Here $\hbar_N > 0$ is an arbitrary lattice constant specifying the regular spacing between adjacent sites.

Once Schur's classification is known, one may ask which particle configurations occur, and with what multiplicity, as the signature of an irreducible component of a representation constructed from irreducibles by means of standard operations. In this paper, we focus on tensor products.

Problem 1.1. *Given a sequence*

$$\hbar_1, \hbar_2, \hbar_3, \ldots$$

of lattice constants and two triangular arrays

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} a_1^{(1)} & & & & \\ a_1^{(2)} & a_2^{(2)} & & & \\ a_1^{(3)} & a_2^{(3)} & a_3^{(3)} & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \end{array} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \begin{array}{cccc} b_1^{(1)} & & & \\ b_1^{(2)} & b_2^{(2)} & & \\ b_1^{(3)} & b_2^{(3)} & b_3^{(3)} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{array} \tag{1}$$

such that, for each $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$a_1^{(N)} > \cdots > a_N^{(N)} \quad \textit{and} \quad b_1^{(N)} > \cdots > b_N^{(N)} \tag{2}$$

specify a pair of particle configurations on $\mathbb{Z}[\hbar_N]$*, let* $\mathbf{V}_N$ *and* $\mathbf{W}_N$ *be the corresponding irreducible representations of* $\mathrm{GL}_N(\mathbb{C})$*. Determine, for each* $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$*, the multiplicity* $\mathrm{mult}_N(c_1, \ldots, c_N)$ *of the irreducible representation* $\mathbf{X}^{(c_1,\ldots,c_N)}$ *indexed by the configuration* $\{c_1 > \cdots > c_N\} \subset \mathbb{Z}[\hbar_N]$ *in the tensor product* $\mathbf{V}_N \otimes \mathbf{W}_N$*.*

In principle, Problem 1.1 is solved by the famous *Littlewood–Richardson rule* (see e.g. [Ful97]), which gives a combinatorial algorithm for computing $\mathrm{mult}_N(c_1, \ldots, c_N)$ in terms of the data (1). However, the complexity of this algorithm is such that, for generic data, its practical implementation quickly becomes unfeasible as N increases. More formally, the computation of these multiplicities is a $\#P$-complete problem, see [Nar06].

In lieu of satisfactory exact formulas, one may pursue a statistical understanding of irreducible subrepresentations of $\mathbf{V}_N \otimes \mathbf{W}_N$. More precisely, the data (1) determines a natural sequence of probability measures $\mathbb{P}_N$ on

particle configurations $\{c_1 > \cdots > c_N\} \subset \mathbb{Z}[\hbar_N]$ obtained by trading the isotypic decomposition

$$\mathbf{V}_N \otimes \mathbf{W}_N = \bigoplus_{c_1 > \cdots > c_N} \mathrm{mult}_N(c_1, \ldots, c_N) \mathbf{X}^{(c_1, \ldots, c_N)}$$

for the isotypic measure

$$\mathbb{P}_N(c_1 > \cdots > c_N) := \frac{\mathrm{mult}_N(c_1, \ldots, c_N) \dim \mathbf{X}^{(c_1, \ldots, c_N)}}{\dim \mathbf{V}_N \dim \mathbf{W}_N}.$$

One may now seek to analyze the *Littlewood–Richardson process*, i.e. the random point process

$$c_1^{(N)} > \cdots > c_N^{(N)} \tag{3}$$

on $\mathbb{Z}[\hbar_N]$ whose law is $\mathbb{P}_N$. This line of investigation was opened twenty years ago by Biane [Bia95], who was among the first to realize its intimate connection with random matrix theory (RMT).

1.2. **Analogy with RMT.** Biane's philosophical point of departure was the principle that the LR process (3) quantizes a certain classical continuous point process, namely the ensemble

$$z_1^{(N)} \geq \cdots \geq z_N^{(N)} \tag{4}$$

of eigenvalues of the random Hermitian matrix $Z_N = X_N + Y_N$ whose summands X_N, Y_N are $N \times N$ random Hermitian matrices with independent, uniformly random eigenvectors and deterministic eigenvalues given by the configurations (2). That (3) is indeed a quantization of (4) in some meaningful sense may be understood in the general context of the Kirillov-Kostant orbit method, see e.g. [KT01, GS82, Hec82] for more along these lines.

The eigenvalue process (4) admits a very natural family of global observables, namely the real random variables

$$\overline{p}_k^{(N)} := \frac{1}{N} p_k(z_1^{(N)}, \ldots, z_N^{(N)}), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}^*,$$

where

$$p_k(x_1, \ldots, x_N) = x_1^k + \cdots + x_N^k \tag{5}$$

is the Newton power sum symmetric function of degree k. For any $r, k_1, \ldots, k_r \in \mathbb{N}^*$, one has a corresponding obvious equality of r-point correlation functions:

$$\langle \overline{p}_{k_1}^{(N)} \cdots \overline{p}_{k_r}^{(N)} \rangle = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{tr}(Z_N^{k_1}) \cdots \mathrm{tr}(Z_N^{k_r}) \right]. \tag{6}$$

Here $\mathrm{tr} = N^{-1} \mathrm{Tr}$ is the normalized matrix trace, $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes expectation with respect to the law of (4), and $\mathbb{E}$ denotes expectation with respect to the

distribution of Z_N in the space of $N \times N$ Hermitian matrices. The formula (6) allows one to analyze the eigenvalue process (4) by working with mixed moments of the matrix elements of Z_N, and these can in turn be addressed by leveraging the stochastic independence of the matrix elements of X_N and Y_N. This is an instance of the *moment method*, a ubiquitous and powerful technique in random matrix theory, see e.g. [AGZ10].

A remarkable analogue of (6) for the LR process was found by Biane [Bia95], who followed the quantum/classical analogy between the particle systems (3) and (4) to its natural conclusion. More precisely, Biane discovered that a formula analogous to (6) holds for the LR process provided one broadens the scope of RMT to include *quantum random matrices*. Thus, Problem 1.1 becomes a part of RMT once quantum random matrices are brought into the game.

1.3. **Biane–Perelomov–Popov quantization.** Let us describe Biane's fundamental insight. The first step is to understand how to quantize the classical random Hermitian matrices X_N, Y_N. Up to minor modifications, the required quantization was constructed in the 1960s by Perelomov and Popov [PP67], see also Želobenko [Žel73]. It is as follows. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, introduce two $N \times N$ matrices defined by

$$A_N := \begin{bmatrix} & \vdots & \\ \dots & \rho_N(\hbar_N e_{ij}) \otimes I_{\mathbf{W}_N} & \dots \\ & \vdots & \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$B_N := \begin{bmatrix} & \vdots & \\ \dots & I_{\mathbf{V}_N} \otimes \sigma_N(\hbar_N e_{ij}) & \dots \\ & \vdots & \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\{e_{ij}\}$ are the standard generators of the universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{gl}_N(\mathbb{C}))$ and ρ_N, σ_N are the actions of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{gl}_N(\mathbb{C}))$ on $\mathbf{V}_N$ and $\mathbf{W}_N$ induced by the respective linear actions of $\mathrm{GL}_N(\mathbb{C})$ on these vector spaces. The matrices A_N, B_N so defined are quantum random matrices in the sense that their entries are quantum random variables[1] living in the noncommutative probability space $(\mathcal{A}_N, \mathbb{E})$, where $\mathcal{A}_N$ is the algebra

$$\mathcal{A}_N := \mathrm{End}\, \mathbf{V}_N \otimes \mathrm{End}\, \mathbf{W}_N$$

[1]In the interest of brevity, we assume familiarity with the standard notions and terminology of noncommutative probability, particularly free probability. The basic definitions are summarized for the reader's convenience in Appendix A.

and $\mathbb{E}\colon \mathcal{A}_N \to \mathbb{C}$ is the quantum expectation functional defined by

$$\mathbb{E} := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathbf{V}_N} \otimes \mathrm{tr}_{\mathbf{W}_N},$$

with

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathbf{V}_N} := \frac{1}{\dim \mathbf{V}_n} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbf{V}_N} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{tr}_{\mathbf{W}_N} := \frac{1}{\dim \mathbf{W}_n} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbf{W}_N}$$

the normalized traces on $\mathrm{End}\,\mathbf{V}_N$ and $\mathrm{End}\,\mathbf{W}_N$, respectively.

We shall refer to the quantum random matrices A_N, B_N as *Biane–Perelomov–Popov matrices*, or BPP matrices for short. In Appendix C, we present a self-contained argument, in the spirit of geometric quantization, which explains why the BPP matrices A_N, B_N may be viewed as a natural quantization of the classical random Hermitian matrices X_N, Y_N in line with the principles of the orbit method. A more pedestrian justification is simply that "it works" — BPP matrices provide us with a quantum analogue of the formula (6), which can be harnessed to analyze the LR process.

As shown by Perelomov and Popov, traces of powers of A_N and B_N are scalar operators in $\mathcal{A}_N$ — this is the quantum analogue of the fact that the classical random matrices X_N, Y_N have deterministic spectra. In fact, Perelomov and Popov showed that, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, one has

$$\mathrm{Tr}(A_N^k) = \wp_k(a_1^{(N)}, \dots, a_N^{(N)}) I_{\mathbf{V}_N} \otimes I_{\mathbf{W}_N}$$
$$\mathrm{Tr}(B_N^k) = \wp_k(b_1^{(N)}, \dots, b_N^{(N)}) I_{\mathbf{V}_N} \otimes I_{\mathbf{W}_N},$$

where

$$\wp_k(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{j \neq i} \left(1 - \frac{\hbar_N}{x_i - x_j}\right) x_i^k \tag{7}$$

is a quantum deformation of the Newton power sum (5).

Biane realized that the deformed power sums $\wp_k$ yield the "right" family of global observables of the discrete point process (3). Let us introduce the real random variables

$$\overline{\wp}_k^{(N)} := \frac{1}{N} \wp_k(c_1^{(N)}, \dots, c_N^{(N)}), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}^*, \tag{8}$$

which we will refer to as the *Biane–Perelomov–Popov observables* of the LR process, or *BPP observables* for short. The relationship between BPP observables and BPP matrices is completely analogous to the relationship between Newton observables and random Hermitian matrices. More precisely, for any $r, k_1, \dots, k_r \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\langle \overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)} \cdots \overline{\wp}_{k_r}^{(N)} \rangle = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{tr}(C_N^{k_1}) \cdots \mathrm{tr}(C_N^{k_r})\right], \tag{9}$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes expectation with respect to the LR measure $\mathbb{P}_N$ on the left hand side, and on the right hand side $\mathbb{E}\colon \mathcal{A}_N \to \mathbb{C}$ is the quantum

expectation functional applied to the corresponding product of traces of the quantum random matrix $C_N = A_N + B_N$. This is the perfect quantum analogue of (6).

1.4. **The semiclassical/large-dimension limit.** The relationship (9) between BPP matrices and BPP observables is a useful tool in the analysis of the LR process only insofar as the moment method can be adapted to the setting of quantum random matrices. The generalization of the moment method from random Hermitian matrices to BPP matrices turns out to be a highly nontrivial undertaking; the complete and correct development of this moment calculus constitutes the technical core of the present paper.

The main obstacle in lifting the moment method from classical random matrices to quantum random matrices is, of course, noncommutativity. While it is true that the matrix elements $(A_N)_{ij}$ and $(B_N)_{ij}$ of A_N and B_N form two families of classically independent quantum random variables in $(\mathcal{A}_N, \mathbb{E})$, the members of these families do not commute amongst themselves: in general,

$$\big[(A_N)_{ij}, (A_N)_{kl}\big] \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \big[(B_N)_{ij}, (B_N)_{kl}\big] \neq 0.$$

Instead, the matrix elements of A_N and B_N are governed by the commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned}\big[(A_N)_{ij}, (A_N)_{kl}\big] &= \hbar_N \left(\delta_{jk}\,(A_N)_{il} - \delta_{li}\,(A_N)_{kj}\right), \\ \big[(B_N)_{ij}, (B_N)_{kl}\big] &= \hbar_N \left(\delta_{jk}\,(B_N)_{il} - \delta_{li}\,(B_N)_{kj}\right),\end{aligned}$$

which are inherited from the defining relations of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{gl}_N(\mathbb{C}))$. This noncommutativity adds a new layer of complexity to the moment method — working with mixed moments in the entries of A_N and B_N is vastly more complicated than working with mixed moments in the entries of their classical counterparts, X_N and Y_N.

Daunting as this may seem, there is a potential simplification at hand if we exploit a parameter which we have so far ignored: the lattice constant $\hbar_N$. The choice of the sequence $(\hbar_N)_{N=1}^{\infty}$ in the formulation of Problem 1.1 is arbitrary — it has no bearing at all on the solution of the problem. However, a glance at the commutation relations (1.4) reveals that, if $\hbar_N$ is very small, the matrix elements of each BPP matrix exhibit approximately classical (commutative) behavior, while the pair A_N, B_N retains its quantum (noncommutative) aspect — an instance of the *semiclassical limit*. Moreover, when $\hbar_N$ is small, the BPP symmetric functions (7) are approximately equal to the Newton symmetric functions (5). It is thus reasonable to hope that, in the semiclassical limit, the moment method for BPP matrices degenerates to the moment method for classical random Hermitian matrices. This would indeed be the case in a pure semiclassical limit where N is fixed and $\hbar \to 0$ independently of N, as considered for example in [CŚ09b].

However, in order to make use of the semiclassical limit in the context of Problem 1.1, we are obliged to contend with an analysis of the much more delicate situation where $\hbar_N \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. This is a subtle coupling of the semiclassical and the large dimension limits in which the decay rate of $\hbar_N$ as a function of N cannot be ignored.

1.5. **Mean values and asymptotic freeness.** We now come to the main result of the present paper, which concerns the behavior of the 1-point functions of the BPP observables of the LR process, i.e. the mean values

$$\langle \overline{\wp}_k^{(N)} \rangle = \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(C_N^k), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}^*, \tag{10}$$

in the simultaneous semiclassical/large-dimension limit.

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$\langle \overline{\wp}_k^{(N)} \rangle = \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}((A_N + B_N)^k),$$

and the expression on the right is evaluated by taking the expected normalized trace $\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}$ of all words of length k in the matrices A_N, B_N, and summing the resulting quantities. Thus knowledge of the 1-point functions (10) is equivalent to knowledge of the data set

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p(1)} B_N^{q(1)} \cdots A_N^{p(d)} B_N^{q(d)}), \quad d \in \mathbb{N}^*,\ p, q \colon [d] \to \mathbb{N},$$

which is precisely the joint distribution of A_N, B_N viewed as quantum random variables living in the noncommutative probability space $(\mathrm{Mat}_N(\mathcal{A}_N), \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr})$, with $\mathrm{Mat}_N(\mathcal{A}_N)$ the algebra of $N \times N$ matrices over $\mathcal{A}_N$.

The joint distribution of A_N, B_N in the semiclassical/large-dimension limit was first addressed by Biane in [Bia95], who proved that A_N, B_N are *asymptotically free* with respect to the state $\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}$ — in the sense of Voiculescu's free probability theory — provided the lattice constant $\hbar_N$ decays superpolynomially in N, i.e. $\hbar_N = o(N^{-\chi})$ as $N \to \infty$ for any scaling exponent $\chi \in \mathbb{N}^*$. This result was subsequently improved by Collins and Śniady [CŚ09a], who showed that it holds assuming only superlinear decay, $\hbar_N = o(N^{-1})$. In this superlinear regime, the rapid decay of the semiclassical parameter results in the suppression of quantum effects well before the large N limit. Recently, Bufetov and Gorin [BG15, Conjecture 1.8] have conjectured that A_N, B_N remain asymptotically free when $\hbar_N$ decays only linearly in N, i.e. $\hbar_N = \Theta(N^{-1})$; this regime is much more delicate, and quantum effects persist into the large N limit.

In this paper, we completely dispense with any assumptions on the decay rate of the semiclassical parameter $\hbar_N$, and prove an optimal result: the BPP matrices A_N, B_N are asymptotically free in **all** semiclassical/large-dimension limits. In particular, this uniformly subsumes the previous results of Biane and Collins–Śniady, and proves and generalizes the conjecture of Bufetov and Gorin.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $\hbar_N = o(1)$ as $N \to \infty$, and the data* (1) *is such that, for each fixed $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$ the limits*

$$x_p := \lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^p) \quad \textit{and} \quad y_q := \lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(B_N^q)$$

exist. Then, the quantum random matrices A_N, B_N are asymptotically free with respect to the state $\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}$.

A corollary of Theorem 1.2 is that the 1-point functions of the BPP observables of the LR process converge in any and all semiclassical/large-dimension limits, and their limiting values are completely and explicitly determined by the universal formulas of free probability theory.

Corollary 1.3. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2, the limit*

$$\overline{\wp}_k^{(\infty)} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \langle \overline{\wp}_k^{(N)} \rangle$$

exists for each fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and is given by an explicit polynomial in the limits $x_1, x_2, \ldots$ and $y_1, y_2, \ldots$.

Theorem 1.2 should be viewed as the natural geometric quantization of Voiculescu's fundamental theorem on the asymptotic freeness of unitarily invariant random Hermitian matrices with deterministic spectra [Voi91]. From this point of view, Theorem 1.2 provides a "quantum alternative" to the usual practice of modeling abstract free random variables using large (classical) random matrices, which is the main tool in applications of free probability to operator algebras. On the quantum side, one also has the additional parameter $\hbar_N$, whose decay rate may be chosen at will. This extra degree of freedom could potentially be useful in the construction of concrete asymptotic models of abstract free random variables.

1.6. **Proof strategy.** The proof of Theorem 1.2 occupies Section 2 and Section 3 below. Our proof strategy is as follows. Fix a particular choice of the discrete parameters $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p, q\colon [d] \to \mathbb{N}$, and let

$$\tau_N = \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p(1)} B_N^{q(1)} \cdots A_N^{p(d)} B_N^{q(d)}) \tag{11}$$

be the corresponding mixed moment of A_N, B_N. Building on (and, in some cases, correcting) techniques pioneered by Biane in his second groundbreaking paper on asymptotic representation theory [Bia98], we demonstrate that τ_N decomposes as

$$\tau_N = \mathrm{Classical}_N + \hbar_N\, \mathrm{Quantum}_N, \tag{12}$$

where $\mathrm{Classical}_N$ and $\mathrm{Quantum}_N$ are polynomial functions of the pure moments

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N), \ldots, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{|p|}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(B_N), \ldots, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(B_N^{|q|}),$$

with $|p| = p(1)+\cdots+p(d)$ the ℓ^1-norm of p, and $|q| = q(1)+\cdots+q(d)$ the ℓ^1-norm of q. The classical part of τ_N is independent of the Planck constant $\hbar_N$ — its form coincides exactly with the resolution of the classical random matrix mixed moment

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(X_N^{p(1)}Y_N^{q(1)}\cdots X_N^{p(d)}Y_N^{q(d)})$$

as a polynomial in the pure moments

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(X_N),\ldots,\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(X_N^{|p|}) \quad \text{and } \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(Y_N),\ldots,\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(Y_N^{|q|}).$$

The quantum part of τ_N, which is a polynomial in the pure moments (1.6) whose coefficients are themselves polynomials in $\hbar_N$ and N, is present because of the noncommutativity of the entries of BPP matrices.

In order to move past previous works and free our analysis from contrived assumptions on the decay rate of $\hbar_N$, we must establish unconditional control on the growth of the quantum part. Refining the combinatorial analysis from [Bia98], we demonstrate that, under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2, the quantum part of τ_N remains bounded as $N \to \infty$ even when $\hbar_N = \hbar$ is fixed. Thus, when $\hbar_N$ varies with N, the classical/quantum decomposition yields the estimate

$$\tau_N = \mathrm{Classical}_N + O(\hbar_N)$$

as $N \to \infty$. It follows that τ_N agrees with its classical component up to an error determined precisely by the order of magnitude of the semiclassical parameter; in particular, we have

$$\tau_N = \mathrm{Classical}_N + o(1)$$

whenever $\hbar_N = o(1)$ as $N \to \infty$.

The negligibility of the quantum part of τ_N in the semiclassical/large-dimension limit identifies the classical part as the ultimate source of freeness. Going beyond Biane's computations in [Bia95, Bia98], which relied on techniques of Xu [Xu97] for the computation of polynomial integrals on unitary groups, we use the full power of modern Weingarten Calculus as developed in [Col03, CŚ06, MN13, Nov10] to show that, for any $N \geq d$, the classical part admits an absolutely convergent series expansion of the form

$$\mathrm{Classical}_N = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{e_k(N)}{N^{2k}},$$

where each $e_k(N)$ is a polynomial in the pure moments (1.6) whose coefficients are universal integers enumerating certain special "monotone" paths in the Cayley graph of the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_d$, as generated by the conjugacy class of transpositions. This is a version of the *topological expansion* familiar from the context of classical random matrix theory, and the leading term $e_0(N)$ is exactly the free probability limit. In particular, our proof

of Theorem 1.2 does not rely on prior knowledge that the classical random matrices X_N, Y_N are asymptotically free — rather, it demonstrates that any proof which works for X_N, Y_N also works verbatim for A_N, B_N, in any semiclassical/large-dimension limit.

1.7. **Higher correlators and higher order freeness.** Theorem 1.2, which proves the asymptotic freeness of classically independent BPP matrices under optimal assumptions, should be viewed as the main result of this paper. However, our analysis may be extended beyond the level of 1-point functions to higher correlators of BPP observables and their connected counterparts, i.e. cumulants. In the case of classical random matrices, higher correlators are governed by the theory of *higher order freeness* [MŚS07], and the techniques developed below in order to prove Theorem 1.2 may be pushed to show that fluctuations of traces of words in classically independent BPP matrices are also governed by this theory in any semiclassical/large-dimension limit.

In Section 4, we explain in detail how this works for covariances of traces of words in A_N and B_N, which via Biane's formula (9) determine the covariance of BPP observables of the LR process,

$$\langle \overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)} \overline{\wp}_{k_2}^{(N)} \rangle_c = \langle \overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)} \overline{\wp}_{k_2}^{(N)} \rangle - \langle \overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)} \rangle \langle \overline{\wp}_{k_2}^{(N)} \rangle, \quad k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$

In particular, our analysis implies the following concentration result.

Theorem 1.4. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2, the variance of* $\overline{\wp}_k^{(N)}$ *tends to zero as* $N \to \infty$.

Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 together yield, via Chebychev's inequality, a global Law of Large Numbers for the BPP observables of the LR process.

Corollary 1.5. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2, the random variable* $\overline{\wp}_k^{(N)}$ *converges in probability to the deterministic quantity* $\overline{\wp}_k^{(\infty)}$*, as* $N \to \infty$.

Corollary (1.5) is optimal: it uniformly recovers results of Collins–Śniady [CŚ09a] and Bufetov–Gorin [BG15], who worked in the specific scalings $\hbar_N = o(N^{-1})$ and $\hbar_N = \Theta(N^{-1})$, respectively, and simultaneously extends these results to all semiclassical/large-dimension regimes.

1.8. **Remarks: BPP observables vs. Newton observables.** The BPP observables (8) of the point process (3) are precisely the moments of the random probability measure $\mu_{\hbar_N}^{(N)}$ which places random mass

$$\beth_i^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \prod_{j \neq i} \left(1 - \frac{\hbar_N}{c_i^{(N)} - c_j^{(N)}} \right)$$

at the random point $c_i^{(N)}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq N$. Let us call this measure the *Biane–Perelomov–Popov measure* of the LR process. It is a deformation of the usual empirical measure $\mu_0^{(N)}$, which simply places uniform mass $1/N$ at each of the random points $c_i^{(N)}$, and whose moments are the Newton observables

$$p_k^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} p_k(c_1^{(N)}, \ldots, c_N^{(N)})$$

of the LR process. The empirical measure $\mu_0^{(N)}$ is, probabilistically, more natural than its deformation, the BPP measure $\mu_{\hbar_N}^{(N)}$; in particular, its moments are simply the Newton observables of the LR process. However, the formula (9) forces us to prefer the BPP measure over the standard empirical measure: we have a matrix model for the former, but not for the latter.

Despite the somewhat strange appearance of the BPP observables, there are a number of reassuring things which one may say about them. First, correlation functions of BPP observables in fact coincide with correlation functions of Newton observables in the semiclassical/large-dimension limit with superlinear decay [CŚ09a]: if $\hbar_N = o(N^{-1})$ as $N \to \infty$ then, for any fixed $r, k_1, \ldots, k_r \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\langle \overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)} \cdots \overline{\wp}_{k_r}^{(N)} \rangle = \langle \overline{p}_{k_1}^{(N)} \cdots \overline{p}_{k_r}^{(N)} \rangle + o(1)$$

as $N \to \infty$. So, in this regime where quantum effects are quenched well before the large N limit, the two families of observables are interchangeable.

Unfortunately, this consonance is broken at any slower decay rate. The case of linear decay, $\hbar_N = \Theta(N^{-1})$, was studied extensively by Bufetov and Gorin [BG15], and in this regime the correlation functions of the two families of observables no longer agree in the semiclassical/large-dimension limit, despite the fact that the correlation functions of both converge in this regime under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2. However, a version of the Markov–Krein correspondence established by Bufetov and Gorin allows one to pass between the two families. Combining the Bufetov–Gorin correspondence with Theorems 1.2 and 1.4, one recovers the Law of Large Numbers for the Newton observables of the LR process at the linear scale $\hbar_N = \Theta(N^{-1})$, which is [BG15, Theorem 1.1].

The regime in which the Planck constant decays at a sublinear rate $\hbar_N \gg N^{-1}$ is rather different and quite interesting. In this regime, the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2 would not hold for *any* choice of input data (1) were the BPP matrices A_N, B_N to be replaced by their classical counterparts, the random Hermitian matrices X_N, Y_N. This means that the Newton observables of the LR process are meaningless in any semiclassical/large-dimension

regime where $\hbar_N$ decays more slowly than N^{-1}. However, the BPP observables receive nonzero contributions only from *isolated* points, i.e. particles within a configuration whose neighboring lattice sites are vacant. Consequently, Theorem 1.2 (an all our other results) retain their content even in these "nearly quantum" regimes where $\hbar_N$ decays extremely slowly as N increases.

2. Mean Values at the Planck Scale

In this section, we fix a particular but arbitrary choice of the discrete parameters d, p, q, and let τ_N denote the corresponding mixed moment (11). We analyze τ_N at the Planck scale, $\hbar_N = \hbar$ fixed, where quantum effects hold full sway. In particular, we derive the classical/quantum decomposition of τ_N announced above as equation (12). The results of this section are non-asymptotic, i.e. they hold for any $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

2.1. **Unitary invariance.**

Our starting point is the following observation of Biane: unitary invariance survives quantization. More precisely, we have the following distributional symmetry of A_N and B_N.

Proposition 2.1 ([Bia98, Section 9.2])**.** *Let $\mathrm{U}(N)$ denote the group of $N \times N$ complex unitary matrices, and define a function $f_N \colon \mathrm{U}(N) \to \mathbb{C}$ by*

$$f_N(U) := \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\left(U A_N^{p(1)} U^{-1} B_N^{q(1)} \cdots U A_N^{p(d)} U^{-1} B_N^{q(d)}\right).$$

Then, f_N is constant, being equal to τ_N for all $U \in \mathrm{U}(N)$.

As a consequence of Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\tau_N = \int_{\mathrm{U}(N)} f_N(U)\,\mathrm{d}U,$$

where the integration is against the unit-mass Haar measure on $\mathrm{U}(N)$. Expanding the trace, this averaging invariance gives us the following representation:

$$\tau_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{r\colon [4d]\to[N]} \int_{\mathrm{U}(N)} \mathbb{E}\left[U_{r(1)r(2)} \left(A_N^{p(1)}\right)_{r(2)r(3)} U^{-1}_{r(3)r(4)} \left(B_N^{q(1)}\right)_{r(4)r(5)} \cdots \right.$$
$$\left. \cdots U_{r(4d-3)r(4d-2)} \left(A_N^{p(d)}\right)_{r(4d-2)r(4d-1)} U^{-1}_{r(4d-1)r(4d)} \left(B_N^{q(d)}\right)_{r(4d)r(1)}\right] \mathrm{d}U.$$

Let us reparametrize the summation index $r\colon [4d] \to [N]$ by the quadruple of functions $i, j, i', j'\colon [d] \to [N]$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(r(1), r(2), r(3), r(4), \ldots, r(4d-3), r(4d-2), r(4d-1), r(4d)\big)\\ =&\Big(\underbrace{i(1), j(1), j'(1), i'(1)}_{\text{group of four}}, \ldots, \underbrace{i(d), j(d), j'(d), i'(d)}_{\text{group of four}}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

d groups

Then, using the classical independence of the families of (quantum) random variables $\{(A_N)_{ij}\}$ and $\{(B_N)_{ij}\}$ in $(\mathcal{A}_N, \mathbb{E})$, the above becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_N &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j,i',j'\colon [d]\to[N]} I_N(i,j,i',j')\, \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{k=1}^{d} \left(A_N^{p(k)}\right)_{j(k)j'(k)} \left(B_N^{q(k)}\right)_{i'(k)i\gamma(k)}\right]\\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j,i',j'\colon [d]\to[N]} I_N(i,j,i',j')\, \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{k=1}^{d} \left(A_N^{p(k)}\right)_{j(k)j'(k)}\right] \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{k=1}^{d} \left(B_N^{q(k)}\right)_{i'(k)i\gamma(k)}\right],\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma = (1\ 2\ \ldots\ d)$ is the full forward cycle in the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_d$, and

$$I_N(i,j,i',j') := \int_{\mathrm{U}(N)} \prod_{k=1}^{d} U_{i(k)j(k)} \overline{U}_{i'(k)j'(k)}\, \mathrm{d}U. \tag{13}$$

2.2. **The Weingarten function.** Matrix integrals of the form (13) have a long history in mathematical physics; they appear in contexts ranging from lattice gauge theory to quantum chromodynamics and string theory, see e.g. [BB96, BDW77, GT93, Sam80, Xu97]. In the context of free probability and random matrices, these integrals were treated by Collins [Col03] and Collins–Śniady [CŚ06], who proved that

$$I_N(i,j,i',j') = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2} \delta_{i',i\alpha}\delta_{j',j\beta}\, \mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta), \tag{14}$$

where

$$\mathrm{Wg}_N\colon \mathfrak{S}_d^2 \to \mathbb{Q}$$

is a special function on pairs of permutations which they named the *Weingarten function*.

There are now several descriptions of the Weingarten function available; in this paper, we will use a series expansion of Wg_N obtained by Novak [Nov10] and Matsumoto–Novak [MN13], which is explained in Section 3. For now, plugging (14) into our calculation above eliminates the indices

i', j' and produces the formula

$$\tau_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2} \mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\, \mathbb{E}[S_\alpha]\, \mathbb{E}[S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}], \tag{15}$$

where

$$S_\alpha := \sum_{i\colon [d]\to[N]} \prod_{k=1}^{d} \left(A_N^{p(k)}\right)_{i(k)i\alpha(k)} \tag{16}$$

and

$$S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma} := \sum_{i\colon [d]\to[N]} \prod_{k=1}^{d} \left(B_N^{q(k)}\right)_{i(k)i\beta^{-1}\gamma(k)}. \tag{17}$$

Our goal now is to express the operators (16) and (17) in terms of the operators

$$\mathrm{tr}(A_N), \mathrm{tr}(A_N^2), \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{tr}(B_N), \mathrm{tr}(B_N^2), \dots,$$

a task which is non-trivial due to the fact that the matrix elements of A_N and B_N do not commute. It is advantageous to lift this problem to the universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{gl}_N)$.

2.3. **Casimirs and Biasimirs.** Let Z_N be the $N \times N$ matrix over $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{gl}_N)$ with elements $(Z_N)_{ij} = \hbar e_{ij}$. This matrix was introduced by Perelomov and Popov [PP67], who studied traces of its powers,

$$C_k := \mathrm{Tr}\, Z_N^k = \sum_{i\colon [k]\to[N]} (Z_N)_{i(1)i(2)} \cdots (Z_N)_{i(k)i(1)}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}^*,$$

which they called *higher Casimirs*, see also [Žel73]. This nomenclature stems from the fact that, up to a multiplicative factor of $\hbar^2$, the element C_2 coincides with the usual Casimir element which resides in the center $\mathcal{Z}_N$ of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{gl}_N)$. The following Theorem summarizes the main properties of higher Casimirs.

Theorem 2.2 ([PP67, Žel73])**.** *The higher Casimirs generate $\mathcal{Z}_N$ as a polynomial ring,*

$$\mathcal{Z}_N = \mathbb{C}[C_1, C_2, C_3, \dots].$$

Moreover, if $(\mathbf{X}, \rho)$ is the irreducible representation of $\mathrm{GL}_N(\mathbb{C})$ indexed by the particle configuration $c_1 > \cdots > c_N$ on $\mathbb{Z}[\hbar]$, the image of C_k in this representation is the scalar operator

$$\rho(C_k) = \wp_k(c_1, \dots, c_N) I_{\mathbf{X}}$$

with eigenvalue

$$\wp_k(c_1,\ldots,c_N)=\sum_{i=1}^{N}\prod_{j\neq i}\left(1-\frac{\hbar}{c_i-c_j}\right)c_i^k.$$

Note that traces of powers of our quantum random matrices A_N and B_N, which are operators acting in $\mathbf{V}_N\otimes\mathbf{W}_N$, are essentially images of higher Casimirs in irreducible representations; more precisely, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}(A_N^k)&=\rho_N(C_k)\otimes I_{\mathbf{W}_N},\\ \mathrm{Tr}(B_N^l)&=I_{\mathbf{V}_N}\otimes\sigma_N(C_l).\end{aligned}$$

In particular, by Theorem 2.2, these traces are the following scalar operators,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}(A_N^k)&=\wp_k(a_1^{(N)},\ldots,a_N^{(N)})I_{\mathbf{V}_N}\otimes I_{\mathbf{W}_N},\\ \mathrm{Tr}(B_N^l)&=\wp_k(b_1^{(N)},\ldots,b_N^{(N)})I_{\mathbf{V}_N}\otimes I_{\mathbf{W}_N}.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that, for any $k,l\in\mathbb{N}^*$, the operators $\mathrm{Tr}(A_N^k)$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(A_N^l)$ are classically independent quantum random variables in $(\mathcal{A}_N,\mathbb{E})$ with known distributions, and similarly for the operators $\mathrm{Tr}(B_N^k),\mathrm{Tr}(B_N^l)$.

In order to understand the operators $S_\alpha,S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}$ which appear in our formula (15) for τ_N, we must understand certain elements of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{gl}_N)$ which further generalize higher Casimirs. More precisely, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}S_\alpha&=\rho_N(C_\alpha^{(p)})\otimes I_{\mathbf{W}_N}\\ S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}&=I_{\mathbf{V}_N}\otimes\sigma_N(C_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}^{(q)}),\end{aligned}$$

where, for any permutation $\pi\in\mathfrak{S}_d$ and function $r\colon[d]\to\mathbb{N}$, we define

$$C_\pi^{(r)}:=\sum_{i\colon[d]\to[N]}(Z_N^{r(1)})_{i(1)i\pi(1)}\cdots(Z_N^{r(d)})_{i(d)i\pi(d)}. \tag{18}$$

Elements in $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{gl}_N)$ of the form (18) were first considered by Biane in [Bia98], and we shall refer to them as *Biasimirs*, a portmanteau of "Biane" and "Casimir". Indeed, if $\pi=\gamma$ is the full forward cycle in $\mathfrak{S}_d$, then $C_\pi^{(r)}$ reduces to the higher Casimir $C_{|r|}$.

Let us look at some examples of Biasimirs. As an easy example, take $d=5$ and $\pi\in\mathfrak{S}_5$ to be the permutation $\pi=(1\ 2\ 3)(4\ 5)$. Then, for any $r\colon[5]\to[N]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}C_\pi^{(r)}&=\sum_{i\colon[5]\to[N]}(Z_N^{r(1)})_{i(1)i(2)}(Z_N^{r(2)})_{i(2)i(3)}(Z_N^{r(3)})_{i(3)i(1)}(Z_N^{r(4)})_{i(4)i(5)}(Z_N^{r(5)})_{i(5)i(4)}\\ &=C_{r(1)+r(2)+r(3)}C_{r(4)+r(5)}.\end{aligned}$$

More generally, whenever $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_d$ is a *canonical permutation*, i.e. a permutation of the form

$$\pi = (1\ 2\ \dots\ n_1)(n_1+1\ n_1+2\ \dots\ n_1+n_2)\cdots, \tag{19}$$

for some composition $(n_1, n_2, \dots)$ of d, the corresponding Biasimir will be a simple monomial function of Casimirs. To be precise, if $\pi = \gamma_1\gamma_2\cdots\gamma_k$ is the disjoint cycle decomposition of a canonical permutation π, then

$$C_\pi^{(r)} = \prod_{j=k}^{\ell} C_{\sum_{i\in\gamma_j} r(i)}. \tag{20}$$

Biasimirs corresponding to non-canonical permutations are more complicated functions of higher Casimirs. For example, consider the Biasimir of degree $d = 3$ corresponding to the non-canonical permutation $\pi = (1\ 3\ 2)$ and some general power function r such that $r(2) = r(3) = 1$,

$$C_\pi^{(r)} = \sum_{i\colon [3]\to[N]} (Z_N^{r(1)})_{i(1)i(3)} (Z_N)_{i(2)i(1)} (Z_N)_{i(3)i(2)}.$$

This is *not* the higher Casimir $C_{r(1)+2}$, because the factors in each term of the sum are in the wrong order. However, we can sort the letters in each summand using the commutation relations

Carrying this out and summing over all $i\colon [3]\to[N]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C_\pi^{(r)} &= \operatorname{Tr} Z_N^{r(1)} Z_N Z_N + \hbar \operatorname{Tr} Z_N^{r(1)} \operatorname{Tr} Z_N - \hbar N \operatorname{Tr} Z_N^{r(1)} Z_N \\ &= C_{r(1)+2} + \hbar C_{r(1)}\, C_1 - \hbar N\, C_{r(1)+1}. \end{aligned}$$

In general, we have the following polynomial representation of Biasimirs in terms of higher Casimirs, which is a slightly refined version of [Bia98, Lemma 8.4.1].

Proposition 2.3. *For any permutation $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_d$, and any function $r\colon [d]\to\mathbb{N}$, there exist unique polynomials $\mathbf{P}_\pi^{(p)}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_\pi^{(r)}$ in $|r|$ and $|r|+2$ variables, respectively, such that*

$$C_\pi^{(r)} = \mathbf{P}_\pi^{(r)}(C_1, \dots, C_{|r|}) + \hbar \mathbf{Q}_\pi^{(r)}(\hbar, N, C_1, \dots, C_{|r|})$$

holds for all $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

We refer to the polynomials $\mathbf{P}_\pi^{(r)}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_\pi^{(r)}$ as the "classical" and "quantum" components of the Biasimir $C_\pi^{(r)}$. The classical component is simple, being given by the right hand side of formula (20) above; the quantum component is more complicated. Returning to our previous example, where $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_3$ is the cyclic permutation $\pi = (1\ 3\ 2)$ and $r(2) = r(3) = 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_\pi^{(r)}(C_1, \dots, C_{|r|}) &= C_{r(1)+2}, \\ \mathbf{Q}_\pi^{(r)}(\hbar, N, C_1, \dots, C_{|r|}) &= C_{r(1)} C_1 - N\, C_{r(1)+1} \end{aligned}$$

for the classical and quantum components of the Biasimir $C_\pi^{(r)}$.

Let us view the quantum component $\mathbf{Q}_\pi^{(r)}$ of a given Biasimir $C_\pi^{(r)}$ as an element of the polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z}[\hbar][N, C_1, \ldots, C_{|r|}]$. On this polynomial ring we impose the grading in which each variable $N, C_1, \ldots, C_{|r|}$ has degree one. Let $\mathrm{cyc}(\pi)$ denote the number of factors in the decomposition of π into disjoint cyclic permutations, and let $\mathrm{aex}(\pi)$ denote the number of *antiexceedances* of the permutation $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_d$, that is the number of indices $i \in [d]$ such that $\pi(i) \leq i$. The following Proposition is a small refinement of [Bia98, Proposition 8.5], see also Appendix B.

Proposition 2.4. *The degree of the classical component* $\mathbf{P}_\pi^{(r)}$ *is* $\mathrm{cyc}(\pi)$. *The degree of the quantum component* $\mathbf{Q}_\pi^{(r)}$ *is at most* $\mathrm{aex}(\pi)$.

2.4. **Classical/Quantum decomposition.** We are now ready to obtain the decomposition (12) of τ_N into classical and quantum parts. Let us return to the formula (15) for τ_N, and consider a particular term in the sum corresponding to the pair $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{S}_d^2$.

First, by Proposition 2.3, we have that

$$S_\alpha = \mathbf{P}_\alpha^{(p)}(\operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|}) + \hbar \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^{(p)}(\hbar, N, \operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|}).$$

Let us rewrite this in terms of normalized traces. Put

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}} := \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)}} \mathbf{P}_\alpha^{(p)} \left(\operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|} \right),$$
$$\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}} := \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)}} \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^{(p)} \left(\hbar, N, \operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|} \right).$$

From (20), $\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}$ is an explicit polynomial in the operators

$$\operatorname{tr} A_N, \operatorname{tr} A_N^2, \ldots, \operatorname{tr} A_N^{|p|},$$

while Proposition 2.4 implies that $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}$ is a polynomial in the numbers $\hbar, N^{-1}$ and the operators

$$\operatorname{tr} A_N, \operatorname{tr} A_N^2, \ldots, \operatorname{tr} A_N^{|p|}.$$

We thus have

$$S_\alpha = N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}} + \hbar N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}.$$

Now we apply the expectation $\mathbb{E}$ to both sides of this identity in $\mathcal{A}_N$ to get an identity in $\mathbb{C}$. Because traces of powers of A_N are classically independent, we have

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) := \mathbb{E}\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}} = \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)}} \mathbf{P}_\alpha^{(p)} \left(\mathbb{E} \operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \mathbb{E} \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|} \right),$$
$$\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) := \mathbb{E}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}} = \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)}} \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^{(p)} \left(\hbar, N, \mathbb{E} \operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \mathbb{E} \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|} \right);$$

the first of these is a polynomial in the numbers

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,A_N, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,A_N^2, \ldots, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,A_N^{|p|},$$

while the second is a polynomial in the numbers

$$\hbar, N^{-1}, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,A_N, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,A_N^2, \ldots, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,A_N^{|p|}.$$

We conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_\alpha] = N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)}\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) + \hbar N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N).$$

Second, we have that

$$S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma} = \mathbf{P}^{(q)}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(\mathrm{Tr}\,B_N, \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}\,B_N^{|q|}) + \hbar\mathbf{Q}^{(q)}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(\hbar, N, \mathrm{Tr}\,B_N, \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}\,B_N^{|q|}).$$

Once again, let us rewrite this in terms of normalized traces. Put

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma} := \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}}\mathbf{P}^{(q)}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}\left(\mathrm{Tr}\,B_N, \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}\,B_N^{|q|}\right),$$
$$\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma} := \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}}\mathbf{Q}^{(q)}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}\left(\hbar, N, \mathrm{Tr}\,B_N, \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}\,B_N^{|q|}\right).$$

From (20), $\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}$ is an explicit polynomial in the operators

$$\mathrm{tr}\,B_N, \mathrm{tr}\,B_N^2, \ldots, \mathrm{tr}\,B_N^{|q|},$$

while Proposition 2.4 implies that $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}$ is a polynomial in the numbers $\hbar, N^{-1}$ and the operators

$$\mathrm{tr}\,B_N, \mathrm{tr}\,B_N^2, \ldots, \mathrm{tr}\,B_N^{|q|}.$$

We thus have

$$S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma} = N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma} + \hbar N^{\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}.$$

Once again, we apply $\mathbb{E}$ to both sides of this identity in $\mathcal{A}_N$ to get an identity in $\mathbb{C}$. As above, we declare

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N) := \mathbb{E}\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma} = \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}}\mathbf{P}^{(q)}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}\left(\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,B_N, \ldots, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,B_N^{|q|}\right),$$
$$\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N) := \mathbb{E}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma} = \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}}\mathbf{Q}^{(q)}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}\left(\hbar, N, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,B_N, \ldots, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,B_N^{|q|}\right).$$

The first of these is a polynomial in the numbers

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,B_N, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,B_N^2, \ldots, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,B_N^{|q|},$$

while the second is a polynomial in the numbers

$$\hbar, N^{-1}, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,B_N, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,B_N^2, \ldots, \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\,B_N^{|q|}.$$

We conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}] = N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N) + \hbar N^{\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N).$$

Putting these two calculations together, we compute the (α, β) term of τ_N as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\,\mathbb{E}[S_\alpha]\,\mathbb{E}[S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}] = \\ \mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\left(N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)}\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{A}}_\alpha(N)+\hbar N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{A}}_\alpha(N)\right)\times \\ \times\left(N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N)+\hbar N^{\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Expanding the brackets and summing (α, β) over $\mathfrak{S}_d^2$, we arrive at the classical/quantum decomposition of the mixed moment τ_N.

Theorem 2.5. *We have*

$$\tau_N = \mathrm{Classical}_N + \hbar_N\,\mathrm{Quantum}_N,$$

where

$$\mathrm{Classical}_N = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2} N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)+\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\,\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{A}}_\alpha(N)\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Quantum}_N = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2}\Big(&N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)+\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\,\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{A}}_\alpha(N)\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N)\\ &+N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)+\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\,\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{A}}_\alpha(N)\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N)\\ &+\hbar N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)+\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\,\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{A}}_\alpha(N)\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

3. Mean Value Asymptotics

In this Section, we apply the exact results obtained in Section 2 to analyze the asymptotic behavior of the mixed moment τ_N in the limit where $N \to \infty$ and $\hbar_N \to 0$. We adopt the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2, which is to say that we henceforth assume the limits

$$x_p := \lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^p) \quad \text{and} \quad y_q := \lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(B_N^q)$$

exist for each fixed $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

3.1. The Weingarten function.

A key component of our asymptotic analysis will be an absolutely convergent series expansion for the Weingarten function which renders its asymptotic behavior transparent.

In order to state this expansion, let us identify the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_d$ with its right Cayley graph, as generated by the conjugacy class of transpositions. We denote by $|\cdot|$ the corresponding word norm, so that $|\alpha^{-1}\beta|$ is the graph theory distance from α to β, i.e. the length of a geodesic path in



FIGURE 1. $\mathfrak{S}_4$ with the Biane–Stanley edge-labeling (figure by M. LaCroix).

the Cayley graph joining these two permutations. Equip the Cayley graph with the *Biane–Stanley edge labeling*, in which each edge corresponding to the transposition $(s\ t)$ is marked by t, the larger of the two elements interchanged. This edge labeling was introduced in the context of enumerative combinatorics by Stanley [Sta97] and Biane [Bia02] as a tool to relate parking functions and noncrossing partitions. Figure 1 shows $\mathfrak{S}_4$ with the Biane-Stanley labeling, where 2-edges are drawn in blue, 3-edges in yellow, and 4-edges in red.

A walk on $\mathfrak{S}_d$ is said to be *monotone* if the labels of the edges it traverses form a weakly increasing sequence. The fundamental fact we need [Nov10, MN13] is that the Weingarten function expands as a generating function for monotone walks: we have

$$\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta) = \frac{1}{N^d}\sum_{r=0}^{\infty}(-1)^r\frac{\vec{W}^r(\alpha,\beta)}{N^r}, \tag{21}$$

where $\vec{W}^r(\alpha,\beta)$ is the number of r-step monotone walks on $\mathfrak{S}_d$ which begin at the permutation α and end at the permutation β. This series is absolutely convergent provided $N \geq d$, but divergent if $N < d$ (this divergence is a related to the *De Wit–'t Hooft anomalies* in $\mathrm{U}(N)$ lattice gauge theory, see e.g. [BDW77, Mor11, Sam80]).

Since $\vec{W}^r(\alpha,\beta) = \vec{W}^r(\mathrm{id}, \alpha^{-1}\beta)$, and since every permutation is either even or odd, the number $\vec{W}^r(\alpha,\beta)$ is nonzero if and only if $r = |\alpha^{-1}\beta| + 2g$ for some $g \in \mathbb{N}$. We may thus rewrite (21) as

$$\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta) = \frac{(-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}}{N^{d+|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}} \sum_{g=0}^{\infty} \frac{\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta)}{N^{2g}}, \tag{22}$$

where $\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta) := \vec{W}^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|+2g}(\alpha,\beta)$. The formulas (14) and (22) may be effectively combined to yield a sort of Feynman calculus for unitary matrix integrals, in which the role of Feynman diagrams is played by monotone walks on symmetric groups, see e.g. [GGPN16b, GGPN16a].

3.2. **Quantum asymptotics.** We now show that the quantum part of τ_N can be controlled even for $\hbar_N = \hbar$ fixed. In order to do this, we introduce a new permutation statistic defined by

$$\mathrm{defect}(\pi) = \mathrm{aex}(\pi) - \mathrm{cyc}(\pi), \quad \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_d.$$

Moreover, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k) \in \mathfrak{S}_d^k$, the quantity

$$\mathrm{genus}(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k) := \frac{|\pi_1| + \cdots + |\pi_k| - |\pi_1 \ldots \pi_k|}{2}$$

is a nonnegative integer; we refer to it as the *genus* of the k-tuple $(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)$.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_d$, we have*

$$\mathrm{defect}(\pi) \geq 0.$$

Moreover, for any $(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathfrak{S}_d^2$, we have

$$\mathrm{defect}(\alpha) + \mathrm{defect}(\beta^{-1}\gamma) \leq 2\,\mathrm{genus}(\alpha, \alpha^{-1}\beta, \beta^{-1}\gamma).$$

Proof. The first part is obvious, since each cycle of a permutation gives at least one contribution to the number of antiexceedances.

Our proof of the second part will be based on revisiting the work of Biane. First, we must present a small erratum to his work. In [Bia98], at the top of Page 173, Biane states that

$$-d - 2 - |\alpha^{-1}\beta| + \mathrm{aex}(\alpha) + \mathrm{aex}(\alpha) + \mathrm{aex}(\gamma\epsilon\beta^{-1}) \leq 0$$

for any transposition $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{S}_d$ (note that Biane's notation is different from ours: his q_2 is our d, his σ is our α, his τ is our β, and he denotes by W the product $\gamma\epsilon$ of the long cycle and a transposition). This statement of Biane is incorrect and the correct statement is

$$-d - 2 - |\alpha^{-1}\beta| + \mathrm{aex}(\alpha) + \mathrm{aex}(\gamma\epsilon\beta^{-1}) \leq 0.$$

Also, in the last step of the proof of this inequality Biane claims that he uses part (1) of [Bia98, Lemma 8.2] — actually, the right tool is part (2) of the same lemma.

We are now ready to establish the inequality which is our aim. Just like Biane, we show that for arbitrary permutations $\pi, \phi \in \mathfrak{S}_d$

$$\operatorname{aex}(\gamma\phi^{-1}) = d + 1 - \operatorname{aex}(\phi) \leq d + 1 + |\pi^{-1}\phi| - \operatorname{aex}(\pi).$$

Setting $\phi := \alpha^{-1}\gamma$, $\pi := \beta^{-1}\gamma$ we obtain our target inequality. □

Theorem 3.2. *For any fixed $\hbar_N = \hbar$, $\mathrm{Quantum}_N$ is $O(1)$ as $N \to \infty$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.5, the quantum part of τ_N may be written as

$$\mathrm{Quantum}_N = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2} N^{\operatorname{cyc}(\alpha)+\operatorname{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)-1} \operatorname{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\mathbf{R}_{(\alpha,\beta)}(N), \tag{23}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{R}_{(\alpha,\beta)}(N) =& N^{\operatorname{defect}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{A}}_{\alpha}(N)\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N)\\ &+ N^{\operatorname{defect}(\alpha)}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{A}}_{\alpha}(N)\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N)\\ &+ \hbar N^{\operatorname{defect}(\alpha)+\operatorname{defect}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}(N)\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{A}}_{\alpha}(N)\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(N).\end{aligned}$$

We will show that each term in the sum (23) is $O(1)$.

By the first part of Lemma 3.1, nonnegativity of the defect statistic, we have

$$\mathbf{R}_{(\alpha,\beta)}(N) = O\left(N^{\operatorname{defect}(\alpha)+\operatorname{defect}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\right)$$

for each $(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathfrak{S}_d^2$.

Now, let us consider the order of the factor

$$N^{\operatorname{cyc}(\alpha)+\operatorname{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)-1} \operatorname{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta).$$

Invoking the expansion (22), for any $N \geq d$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}N^{\operatorname{cyc}(\alpha)+\operatorname{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)-1} \operatorname{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta) &= N^{\operatorname{cyc}(\alpha)+\operatorname{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)-1}\frac{(-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}}{N^{d+|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}}\sum_{g=0}^{\infty}\frac{\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta)}{N^{2g}}\\ &= N^{-|\alpha|-|\alpha^{-1}\beta|-|\beta^{-1}\gamma|+|\gamma|}(-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta}\sum_{g=0}^{\infty}\frac{\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta)}{N^{2g}}\\ &= O(N^{-2\operatorname{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma)}).\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that each term of $\mathrm{Quantum}_N$ is of order

$$N^{\operatorname{cyc}(\alpha)+\operatorname{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)-1} \operatorname{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\mathbf{R}_{(\alpha,\beta)}(N) = O\left(N^{\operatorname{defect}(\alpha)+\operatorname{defect}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)-2\operatorname{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma)}\right),$$

and hence is $O(1)$ by the second part of Lemma 3.1. □

3.3. **Classical asymptotics.** We now deal with the asymptotics of the classical part of τ_N.

Theorem 3.3. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2, the classical part of τ_N admits, for each $N \geq d$, the absolutely convergent series expansion*

$$\mathrm{Classical}_N = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{e_k(N)}{N^{2k}},$$

where

$$e_k(N) = \sum_{\substack{(g,h)\in\mathbb{N}^2 \\ g+h=k}} \sum_{\substack{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2 \\ \mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma)=h}} (-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|} \vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}^{\mathbf{B}}(N).$$

Proof. According to Theorem 2.5 and the expansion (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Classical}_N &= \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2} N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)+\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)-1} \,\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}^{\mathbf{B}}(N) \\
&= \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2} N^{-2\,\mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma)} (-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|} \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}^{\mathbf{B}}(N) \sum_{g=0}^{\infty} \frac{\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta)}{N^{2g}} \\
&= \sum_{g,h=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N^{2(g+h)}} \sum_{\substack{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2 \\ \mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma)=h}} (-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|} \vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}^{\mathbf{B}}(N) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{g,h\geq 0 \\ g+h=k}} \frac{1}{N^{k}} \sum_{\substack{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2 \\ \mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma)=h}} (-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|} \vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}^{\mathbf{B}}(N).
\end{aligned}$$

□

3.4. **Semiclassical asymptotics and freeness.** Combining Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.4. *For any sequence $\hbar_N$, we have*

$$\tau_N = \mathrm{Classical}_N + O(\hbar_N)$$

as $N \to \infty$. In particular, if $\hbar_N = o(N^{-2l})$ as $N \to \infty$, then

$$\tau_N = \mathrm{Classical}_N + o(N^{-2l}) = \sum_{k=0}^{l} \frac{e_k(N)}{N^{2k}} + o(N^{-2l}).$$

Let us now explain how the the $l = 0$ case of Corollary 3.4 yields the proof of Theorem 1.2. Assuming only $\hbar_N = o(1)$ as $N \to \infty$, Corollary 3.4 implies

$$\tau_N = \mathrm{Classical}_N + o(1) = e_0(N) + o(1)$$

as $N \to \infty$, with

$$e_0(N) = \sum_{\substack{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2 \\ \mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma)=0}} (-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}\vec{W}_0(\alpha,\beta)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}^{\mathbf{B}}(N).$$

Now, under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2, the limits

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}^{\mathbf{B}} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}^{\mathbf{B}}(N)$$

exists, and are polynomials in $x_1, \ldots, x_{|p|}$ and $y_1, \ldots, y_{|q|}$ given explicitly by the universal form (20) of the classical component. We thus have

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \tau_N = \sum_{\substack{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2 \\ \mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma)=0}} (-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}\vec{W}_0(\alpha,\beta)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}^{\mathbf{B}}.$$

This is exactly asymptotic freeness, see Appendix A. Hence, Theorem 1.2 is proved.

4. Covariance of BPP Observables

In this section we explain how the mean value analysis carried out in Sections 2 and 3, which yields the semiclassical/large-dimension asymptotics of the 1-point functions of BPP observables of the LR process, can be extended to higher correlation functions. We limit our discussion to the connected 2-point correlators (covariances)

$$\langle \overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)} \overline{\wp}_{k_2}^{(N)} \rangle_c = \langle \overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)} \overline{\wp}_{k_2}^{(N)} \rangle - \langle \overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)} \rangle \langle \overline{\wp}_{k_2}^{(N)} \rangle,$$

since these are the most probabilistically meaningful and provide a representative illustration of the general method. In particular, we prove Theorem 1.4 and its consequence, the Law of Large Numbers stated as Corollary 1.5.

4.1. Covariance setup.

According to Biane's formula (9), the covariance of the classical random variables $\overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)}, \overline{\wp}_{k_2}^{(N)}$ coincides with the covariance of the quantum random variables $\mathrm{tr}(C_N^{k_1}), \mathrm{tr}(C_N^{k_2})$:

$$\langle \overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)} \overline{\wp}_{k_2}^{(N)} \rangle_c = \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(C_N^{k_1})\,\mathrm{tr}(C_N^{k_2})] - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(C_N^{k_1})]\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}[(C_N^{k_2})]$$

for any $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*$, where $C_N = A_N + B_N$. For example, in the case of the simplest connected 2-point function, the variance of $\overline{\wp}_1^{(N)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \overline{\wp}_1^{(N)} \overline{\wp}_1^{(N)} \rangle_c &= \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(C_N)\,\mathrm{tr}(C_N)] - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(C_N)]\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(C_N)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(A_N)\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N)] - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(A_N)]\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(A_N)] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(A_N)\,\mathrm{tr}(B_N)] - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(A_N)]\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(B_N)] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(B_N)\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N)] - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(B_N)]\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(A_N)] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(B_N)\,\mathrm{tr}(B_N)] - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(B_N)]\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(B_N)].\end{aligned}$$

In general, in order to compute $\langle \overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)} \overline{\wp}_{k_2}^{(N)} \rangle_c$ in the semiclassical/large-dimension limit, we need to be able to estimate differences of the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p_1(1)} B_N^{q_1(1)} \cdots A_N^{p_1(d_1)} B_N^{q_1(d_1)})\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p_2(1)} B_N^{q_2(1)} \cdots A_N^{p_2(d_2)} B_N^{q_2(d_2)})\right] \\ -&\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p_1(1)} B_N^{q_1(1)} \cdots A_N^{p_1(d_1)} B_N^{q_1(d_1)})]\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p_2(1)} B_N^{q_2(1)} \cdots A_N^{p_2(d_2)} B_N^{q_2(d_2)})]\end{aligned}$$

in the semiclassical/large-dimension limit, where $d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ are fixed positive integers and $p_1, q_1 \colon [d_1] \to \mathbb{N}$ and $p_2, q_d \colon [d_2] \to \mathbb{N}$ are fixed functions. Let us write

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} := \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p_1(1)} B_N^{q_1(1)} \cdots A_N^{p_1(d_1)} B_N^{q_1(d_1)})\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p_2(1)} B_N^{q_2(1)} \cdots A_N^{p_2(d_2)} B_N^{q_2(d_2)})\right]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_1^{(N)} &:= \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p_1(1)} B_N^{q_1(1)} \cdots A_N^{p_1(d_1)} B_N^{q_1(d_1)}) \\ \tau_2^{(N)} &:= \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p_2(1)} B_N^{q_2(1)} \cdots A_N^{p_2(d_2)} B_N^{q_2(d_2)})\end{aligned}$$

for these quantities, so that our goal is to estimate the difference

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} - \tau_1^{(N)} \tau_2^{(N)}$$

in the semiclassical/large-dimension limit. In view of our analysis of mean values in Sections 2 and 3, the second term is understood. It remains to analyze the first term, $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$, and in order to do this we will generalize the approach developed above.

4.2. **2-point functions at the Planck scale.** Let us rewrite $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$ as follows. Put $d = d_1 + d_2$, and define functions $p, q \colon [d] \to \mathbb{N}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} p|_{[d_1]} &= p_1, & p|_{[d_1+1,d]} &= p_2 \\ q|_{[d_1]} &= q_1, & q|_{[d_1+1,d]} &= q_2. \end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p(1)} B_N^{q(1)} \cdots A_N^{p(d_1)} B_N^{q(d_1)})\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p(d_1+1)} B_N^{q(d_1+1)} \cdots A_N^{p(d_1+d_2)} B_N^{q(d_1+d_2)}).\right].$$

It will be convenient to affect the same notational change for the quantities $\tau_1^{(N)}$ and $\tau_2^{(N)}$, that is we write

$$\tau_1^{(N)} = \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p(1)} B_N^{q(1)} \cdots A_N^{p(d_1)} B_N^{q(d_1)})$$
$$\tau_2^{(N)} = \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}(A_N^{p(d_1+1)} B_N^{q(d_1+1)} \cdots A_N^{p(d_1+d_2)} B_N^{q(d_1+d_2)}).$$

We now analyze $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$ following the same steps as in Sections 2 and 3.

4.2.1. *Unitary invariance.*

Proposition 4.1. *Define a function $f\colon \mathrm{U}(N) \to \mathbb{C}$ by*

$$f_N(U) := \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{tr}\left(UA_N^{p(1)}U^{-1}B_N^{q(1)}\cdots UA_N^{p(d_1)}U^{-1}B_N^{q(d_1)}\right)\times\right.$$
$$\left.\times\ \mathrm{tr}\left(UA_N^{p(d_1+1)}U^{-1}B_N^{q(d_1+1)}\cdots UA_N^{p(d_1+d_2)}U^{-1}B_N^{q(d_1+d_2)}\right)\right].$$

Then, f_N is constant, being equal to $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$ for all $U \in \mathrm{U}(N)$.

As a consequence of this invariance, we have

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} = \int_{\mathrm{U}(N)} f_N(U)\mathrm{d}U.$$

We want to use this in exactly the same way as we did in our mean value computation.

Expanding the first trace yields the sum

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{r_1\colon [4d_1]\to[N]} U_{r_1(1)r_1(2)}\left(A_N^{p(1)}\right)_{r_1(2)r_1(3)} U^{-1}_{r_1(3)r_1(4)}\left(B_N^{q(1)}\right)_{r_1(4)r_1(5)}\cdots$$
$$\cdots U_{r_1(4d_1-3)r_1(4d_1-2)}\left(A_N^{p(d_1)}\right)_{r_1(4d_1-2)r_1(4d_1-1)} U^{-1}_{r_1(4d_1-1)r_1(4d_1)}\left(B_N^{q(d_1)}\right)_{r_1(4d_1)r_1(1)}.$$

Expanding the second trace yields the sum

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{r_2\colon [4d_2]\to[N]} U_{r_2(1)r_2(2)}\left(A_N^{p(d_1+1)}\right)_{r_2(2)r_2(3)} U^{-1}_{r_2(3)r_2(4)}\left(B_N^{q(d_1+1)}\right)_{r_2(4)r_2(5)}\cdots$$
$$\cdots U_{r_2(4d_2-3)r_2(4d_2-2)}\left(A_N^{p(d_1+d_2)}\right)_{r_2(4d_2-2)r_2(4d_2-1)} U^{-1}_{r_2(4d_2-1)r_2(4d_2)}\left(B_N^{q(d_1+d_2)}\right)_{r_2(4d_2)r_2(1)}.$$

For the first trace, let us reparametrize the summation index $r_1\colon [4d_1] \to [N]$ by a quadruple of functions $i_1, j_1, i_1', j_1'\colon [d_1] \to [N]$ according to

$$\big(r_1(1), r_1(2), r_1(3), r_1(4), \ldots, r_1(4d_1-3), r_1(4d_1-2), r_1(4d_1-1), r_1(4d_1)\big)$$
$$=\big(i_1(1), j_1(1), j_1'(1), i_1'(1), \ldots, i_1(d_1), j_1(d_1), j_1'(d_1), i_1'(d_1)\big).$$

Then, the above expansion of the first trace becomes

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i_1,j_1,_1i',j'_1\colon [d_1]\to[N]} L_N(i_1,j_1,i'_1,j'_1)\prod_{k=1}^{d_1}\Big(A_N^{p(k)}\Big)_{j_1(k)j'_1(k)}\Big(B_N^{q(k)}\Big)_{i'_1(k)i_1\gamma_1(k)}$$
$$=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i_1,j_1,i'_1,j'_1\colon [d_1]\to[N]} L_N(i_1,j_1,i'_1,j'_1)\prod_{k=1}^{d_1}\Big(A_N^{p(k)}\Big)_{j_1(k)j'_1(k)}\prod_{k=1}^{d_1}\Big(B_N^{q(k)}\Big)_{i'_1(k)i_1\gamma_1(k)},$$

where

$$L_N(i_1,j_1,i'_1,j'_1)=\prod_{k=1}^{d_1}U_{i_1(k)j_1(k)}\overline{U}_{i'_1(k)j'_1(k)},$$

and γ_1 is the cycle $(1\ 2\ \dots\ d_1)$ in $\mathfrak{S}_{d_1+d_2}$.

Similarly, if we reparametrize the summation index $r_2\colon [4d_2]\to[N]$ by a quadruple of functions $i_2,j_2,i'_2,j'_2\colon [d_2]\to[N]$ according to

$$\big(r_2(1),r_2(2),r_2(3),r_2(4),\dots,r_2(4d_2-3),r_2(4d_2-2),r_2(4d_2-1),r_2(4d_2)\big)$$
$$=\big(i_2(d_1+1),j_2(d_1+1),j'_2(d_1+1),i'_2(d_1+1),\dots,i_2(d),j_2(d),j'_2(d),i'_2(d)\big),$$

the expansion of the second trace takes the form

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i_2,j_2,i'_2,j'_2\colon [d_1+1,d_1+d_2]\to[N]} L_N(i_2,j_2,i'_2,j'_2)\prod_{k=d_1+1}^{d_1+d_2}\Big(A_N^{p(k)}\Big)_{j_2(k)j'_2(k)}\Big(B_N^{q(k)}\Big)_{i'_2(k)i_2\gamma'_2(k)}$$
$$=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i_2,j_2,i'_2,j'_2\colon [d_1+1,d_1+d_2]\to[N]} L_N(i_2,j_2,i'_2,j'_2)\prod_{k=d_1+1}^{d_1+d_2}\Big(A_N^{p(k)}\Big)_{j_2(k)j'_2(k)}\prod_{k=1}^{d_2}\Big(B_N^{q(k)}\Big)_{i'_2(k)i_2\gamma'_2(k)},$$

where

$$L_N(i_2,j_2,i'_2,j'_2)=\prod_{k=d_1+1}^{d_1+d_2}U_{i_2(k)j_2(k)}\overline{U}_{i'_2(k)j'_2(k)},$$

and γ'_2 is the cycle $(d_1+1\ d_1+2\ \dots\ d_1+d_2)$ in $\mathfrak{S}_{d_1+d_2}$.

We now smash the expansions of the two traces together to get the huge compound expansion

$$\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i_1,j_1,_1i',j'_1\colon [d_1]\to[N]}\ \sum_{i_2,j_2,i'_2,j'_2\colon [d_1+1,d_1+d_2]\to[N]} L_N(i_1,j_1,i'_1,j'_1)L_N(i_2,j_2,i'_2,j'_2)$$
$$\times\prod_{k=1}^{d_1}\Big(A_N^{p(k)}\Big)_{j_1(k)j'_1(k)}\prod_{k=d_1+1}^{d_1+d_2}\Big(A_N^{p(k)}\Big)_{j_2(k)j'_2(k)}\prod_{k=1}^{d_1}\Big(B_N^{q(k)}\Big)_{i'_1(k)i_1\gamma_1(k)}\prod_{k=d_1+1}^{d_1+d_2}\Big(B_N^{q(k)}\Big)_{i'_2(k)i_2\gamma'_2(k)}$$
$$=\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i,j,i',j'\colon [d_1+d_2]\to[N]} L_N(i,j,i',j')\prod_{k=1}^{d_1+d_2}\Big(A_N^{p(k)}\Big)_{j(k)j'(k)}\prod_{k=1}^{d_1+d_2}\Big(B_N^{q(k)}\Big)_{i'(k)i\gamma_1\gamma'_2(k)},$$

where

$$L_N(i,j,i',j') = \prod_{k=1}^{d_1+d_2} U_{i(k)j(k)}\overline{U}_{i'(k)j'(k)}.$$

Thus, we obtain the following representation of $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$:

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j,i',j' \colon [d_1+d_2]\to[N]} I_N(i,j,i',j') \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{k=1}^{d_1+d_2} \left(A_N^{p(k)}\right)_{j(k)j'(k)}\right] \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{k=1}^{d_1+d_2} \left(B_N^{q(k)}\right)_{i'(k)i\gamma_1\gamma_2'(k)}\right],$$

where

$$I_N(i,j,i',j') = \int_{\mathrm{U}(N)} L_N(i,j,i',j')\mathrm{d}U.$$

Plugging (14) into our calculation above eliminates the indices i', j' and produces the formula

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_{d_1+d_2}^2} \mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\mathbb{E}[S_\alpha]\mathbb{E}[S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}],$$

where

$$S_\alpha := \sum_{i \colon [d_1+d_2]\to[N]} \prod_{k=1}^{d_1+d_2} \left(A_N^{p(k)}\right)_{i(k)i\alpha(k)}$$

and

$$S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'} := \sum_{i \colon [d_1+d_2]\to[N]} \prod_{k=1}^{d_1+d_2} \left(B_N^{q(k)}\right)_{i(k)i\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'(k)}.$$

This generalizes (15) from the expected trace to the expected product of two traces; the formula could be generalized to the expected product of any finite number of traces in just the same way.

Our goal now is to express the operators S_α and $S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}$ in terms of the operators

$$\operatorname{tr} A_N, \operatorname{tr} A_N^2, \ldots \quad \text{and } \operatorname{tr} B_N, \operatorname{tr} B_N^2, \ldots.$$

Just like in the mean value computation, we lift the problem to the universal enveloping algebra and use Biasimirs.

4.2.2. *Biasimirs again.* The operators S_α and $S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}$ are, up to tensoring with an identity operator, images of Biasimirs in irreducible representations:

$$S_\alpha = \rho_N(C_\alpha^{(p)}) \otimes I_{\mathbf{W}_N}$$
$$S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'} = I_{\mathbf{V}_N} \otimes \sigma_N(C_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{(q)}).$$

Each of the Biasimirs $C_\alpha^{(p)}$ and $C_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{(q)}$ has its own classical/quantum decomposition:

$$C_\alpha^{(p)} = \mathbf{P}_\alpha^{(p)}(C_1, \ldots, C_{|p|}) + \hbar_N \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^{(p)}(\hbar_N, N, C_1, \ldots, C_{|p|})$$
$$C_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{(q)} = \mathbf{P}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{(q)}(C_1, \ldots, C_{|q|}) + \hbar_N \mathbf{Q}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{(q)}(\hbar_N, N, C_1, \ldots, C_{|q|}).$$

Now we come back to the operators S_α and $S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}$. First, we have that

$$S_\alpha = \mathbf{P}_\alpha^{(p)}(\operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|}) + \hbar_N \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^{(p)}(\hbar_N, N, \operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|}).$$

Let us rewrite this in terms of normalized traces. Put

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}} := \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)}} \mathbf{P}_\alpha^{(p)} \left(\operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|} \right),$$
$$\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}} := \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)}} \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^{(p)} \left(\hbar_N, N, \operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|} \right).$$

$\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}$ is an explicit polynomial in the operators

$$\operatorname{tr} A_N, \operatorname{tr} A_N^2, \ldots, \operatorname{tr} A_N^{|p|},$$

while $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}$ is a polynomial in the numbers $\hbar_N, N^{-1}$ and the operators

$$\operatorname{tr} A_N, \operatorname{tr} A_N^2, \ldots, \operatorname{tr} A_N^{|p|}.$$

We thus have

$$S_\alpha = N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}} + \hbar_N N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}.$$

Now we want to apply the expectation $\mathbb{E}$ to both sides of this identity in $\mathcal{A}_N$ to get an identity in $\mathbb{C}$. We set

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) := \mathbb{E}\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}} = \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)}} \mathbf{P}_\alpha^{(p)} \left(\mathbb{E} \operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \mathbb{E} \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|} \right),$$
$$\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) := \mathbb{E}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}} = \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)}} \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^{(p)} \left(\hbar_N, N, \mathbb{E} \operatorname{Tr} A_N, \ldots, \mathbb{E} \operatorname{Tr} A_N^{|p|} \right);$$

the first of these is a polynomial in the numbers

$$\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} A_N, \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} A_N^2, \ldots, \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} A_N^{|p|},$$

while the second is a polynomial in the numbers

$$\hbar_N, N^{-1}, \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} A_N, \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} A_N^2, \ldots, \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} A_N^{|p|}.$$

We conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_\alpha] = N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) + \hbar_N N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N).$$

Second, we have that

$$S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'} = \mathbf{P}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{(q)}(\operatorname{Tr} B_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} B_N^{|q|}) + \hbar_N \mathbf{Q}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{(q)}(\hbar_N, N, \operatorname{Tr} B_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} B_N^{|q|}).$$

Once again, let us rewrite this in terms of normalized traces. Put

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'} := \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}}\mathbf{P}^{(q)}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}\left(\operatorname{Tr} B_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} B_N^{|q|}\right),$$
$$\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'} := \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}}\mathbf{Q}^{(q)}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}\left(\hbar_N, N, \operatorname{Tr} B_N, \ldots, \operatorname{Tr} B_N^{|q|}\right).$$

$\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}$ is an explicit polynomial in the operators

$$\operatorname{tr} B_N, \operatorname{tr} B_N^2, \ldots, \operatorname{tr} B_N^{|q|},$$

while $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}$ is a polynomial in the numbers $\hbar_N, N^{-1}$ and the operators

$$\operatorname{tr} B_N, \operatorname{tr} B_N^2, \ldots, \operatorname{tr} B_N^{|q|}.$$

We thus have

$$S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'} = N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'} + \hbar_N N^{\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}.$$

We apply $\mathbb{E}$ to both sides of this identity in $\mathcal{A}_N$ to get an identity in $\mathbb{C}$. As above, we declare

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}(N) := \mathbb{E}\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'} = \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}}\mathbf{P}^{(q)}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}\left(\mathbb{E}\operatorname{Tr} B_N, \ldots, \mathbb{E}\operatorname{Tr} B_N^{|q|}\right),$$
$$\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}(N) := \mathbb{E}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'} = \frac{1}{N^{\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}}\mathbf{Q}^{(q)}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}\left(\hbar_N, N, \mathbb{E}\operatorname{Tr} B_N, \ldots, \mathbb{E}\operatorname{Tr} B_N^{|q|}\right).$$

The first of these is a polynomial in the numbers

$$\mathbb{E}\operatorname{tr} B_N, \mathbb{E}\operatorname{tr} B_N^2, \ldots, \mathbb{E}\operatorname{tr} B_N^{|q|},$$

while the second is a polynomial in the numbers

$$\hbar_N, N^{-1}, \mathbb{E}\operatorname{tr} B_N, \mathbb{E}\operatorname{tr} B_N^2, \ldots, \mathbb{E}\operatorname{tr} B_N^{|q|}.$$

We conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}] = N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}(N) + \hbar_N N^{\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}(N).$$

4.2.3. *Classical/Quantum Decomposition of* $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$. Putting these two calculations together, we compute the (α, β) term of $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\mathbb{E}[S_\alpha]\mathbb{E}[S_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}] = \\ \mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\left(N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)}\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{A}}_{\alpha}(N) + \hbar_N N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{A}}_{\alpha}(N)\right)\times \\ \times\left(N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}\overline{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}(N) + \hbar_N N^{\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathbf{B}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}(N)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Expanding the brackets and summing (α, β) over $\mathfrak{S}_d^2$, we arrive at the classical/quantum decomposition of $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$.

Theorem 4.2. *We have*

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} = \mathrm{Classical}_{12}^{(N)} + \hbar_N \, \mathrm{Quantum}_{12}^{(N)},$$

where

$$\mathrm{Classical}_{12}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2} N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)+\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')} \, \mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Quantum}_{12}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2} \Big(& N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)+\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')} \, \mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N) \\ & + N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)+\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')} \, \mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta) \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N) \\ & + \hbar_N N^{\mathrm{aex}(\alpha)+\mathrm{aex}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')} \, \mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta) \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N) \Big).\end{aligned}$$

4.3. **Covariance asymptotics.** We now apply the above exact computations to obtain the semiclassical asymptotics of $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$. The analysis is a direct generalization of the mean value asymptotic analysis carried out in Section 3. As in Section 3, we work under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2.

4.3.1. *Quantum asymptotics.* The following lemma was proved (in a slightly different notation) by Biane [Bia98, page 173, just above Lemma 9.2.1].

Lemma 4.3. *For any $(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathfrak{S}_d^2$, we have*

$$\mathrm{defect}(\alpha) + \mathrm{defect}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2') \leq 2\,\mathrm{genus}(\alpha, \alpha^{-1}\beta, \beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2').$$

Theorem 4.4. *For any fixed $\hbar_N$, the quantum part $\mathrm{Quantum}_{12}^{(N)}$ of $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$ is $O(1)$ as $N \to \infty$.*

Proof. The quantum part of $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$ may be written as

$$\mathrm{Quantum}_N = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2} N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)+\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')-2} \, \mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta) \mathbf{R}_{(\alpha,\beta)}(N)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{R}_{(\alpha,\beta)}(N) = & N^{\mathrm{defect}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')} \overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N) \\ & + N^{\mathrm{defect}(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N) \\ & + \hbar_N N^{\mathrm{defect}(\alpha)+\mathrm{defect}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}(N) \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N) \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N).\end{aligned}$$

We will show that each term in the sum is $O(1)$.

By the first part of Lemma 3.1, nonnegativity of the defect statistic, we have

$$\mathbf{R}_{(\alpha,\beta)}(N) = O\left(N^{\mathrm{defect}(\alpha)+\mathrm{defect}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}\right)$$

for each $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{S}_d^2$.

Consider now the asymptotics of the Weingarten factor,

$$N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)+\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')-2}\,\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta).$$

By (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)+\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')-2}\,\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\\
&\qquad = N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)+\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')-2}\frac{(-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}}{N^{d+|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}}\sum_{g=0}^{\infty}\frac{\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta)}{N^{2g}}\\
&\qquad = N^{-|\alpha|-|\alpha^{-1}\beta|-|\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'|+|\gamma_1\gamma_2'|}(-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}\sum_{g=0}^{\infty}\frac{\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta)}{N^{2g}}\\
&\qquad = (-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}N^{-2\,\mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}\sum_{g=0}^{\infty}\frac{\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta)}{N^{2g}},
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)+\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')-2}\,\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta) = O(N^{-2\,\mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}).$$

We conclude that the order of the (α, β) term in the sum is

$$O\left(N^{\mathrm{defect}(\alpha)+\mathrm{defect}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')-2\,\mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}\right).$$

By Lemma 4.3,

$$\mathrm{defect}(\alpha)+\mathrm{defect}(\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')-2\,\mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')$$

is nonpositive; consequently, each term of $\mathrm{Quantum}_{12}^{(N)}$ is $O(1)$, as required. □

4.3.2. *Classical asymptotics.*

Theorem 4.5. *For each $N \geq d$, the classical part of $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$ admits, for each $N \geq d$, an absolutely convergent series expansion of the form*

$$\mathrm{Classical}_{12}^{(N)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{e_k^{(12)}(N)}{N^{2k}},$$

the coefficients of which are given by

$$e_k^{(12)}(N) := \sum_{\substack{(g,h)\in\mathbb{N}^2\\ g+h=k}}\ \sum_{\substack{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2\\ \mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')=h}}(-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{A}}(N)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N).$$

Proof. According to Theorem 4.2 and the expansion (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Classical}_{12}^{(N)} &= \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2} N^{\mathrm{cyc}(\alpha)+\mathrm{cyc}(\beta^{-1}\gamma)-2}\,\mathrm{Wg}_N(\alpha,\beta)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N)\\
&= \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2} N^{-2\,\mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')}(-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N)\sum_{g=0}^{\infty}\frac{\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta)}{N^{2g}}\\
&= \sum_{g,h=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{N^{2(g+h)}}\sum_{\substack{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2\\ \mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')=h}}(-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N)\\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\sum_{\substack{g,h\geq 0\\ g+h=k}}\frac{1}{N^k}\sum_{\substack{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2\\ \mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2')=h}}(-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}\vec{W}_g(\alpha,\beta)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_\alpha^{\mathbf{A}}(N)\overline{\mathbf{P}}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma_1\gamma_2'}^{\mathbf{B}}(N).
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.3.3. *Semiclassical asymptotics.* Combining the quantum/classical decomposition of $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$, the boundedness of $\mathrm{Quantum}_{12}^{(N)}$, and the convergent series expansion of $\mathrm{Classical}_{12}^{(N)}$, we obtain the following semiclassical asymptotic expansion of $\tau_{12}^{(N)}$.

Corollary 4.6. *For any sequence $\hbar_N$, we have*

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} = \mathrm{Classical}_{12}^{(N)} + O(\hbar_N).$$

In particular, if $\hbar_N = o(N^{-2l})$, then

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} = \sum_{k=0}^{l}\frac{e_k^{(12)}(N)}{N^{2k}} + o(\frac{1}{N^{2l}}).$$

We may now combine Corollary 3.4 and Corollary 4.6 to obtain the semiclassical/large-dimension asymptotics of the difference

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} - \tau_1^{(N)}\tau_2^{(N)}.$$

According to Corollary 4.6, provided $\hbar_N \to 0$ as $N\to\infty$, we have

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} = \mathrm{Classical}_{12}^{(N)} + o(1)$$

as $N\to\infty$. Moreover, by Corollary 3.4, we have that

$$\tau_1^{(N)}\tau_2^{(N)} = \mathrm{Classical}_1^{(N)}\,\mathrm{Classical}_2^{(N)} + o(1)$$

in this same regime, where $\mathrm{Classical}_1^{(N)}$ is the classical part of $\tau_1^{(N)}$ and $\mathrm{Classical}_2^{(N)}$ is the classical part of $\tau_2^{(N)}$. Thus, we have that

$$\tau_{12}^{(N)} - \tau_1^{(N)}\tau_2^{(N)} = \mathrm{Classical}_{12}^{(N)} - \mathrm{Classical}_1^{(N)}\,\mathrm{Classical}_2^{(N)} + o(1)$$

in the semiclassical/large-dimension limit. This means that the asymptotics of $\tau_{12}^{(N)} - \tau_1^{(N)}\tau_2^{(N)}$ in the semiclassical/large-dimension limit coincide with the corresponding classical random matrix asymptotics in the large-dimension limit, up to replacing the Newton power-sum symmetric functions with the BPP symmetric functions. Thus, any computation of the covariance of the Newton observables $\langle \overline{p}_{k_1}^{(N)} \overline{p}_{k_2}^{(N)} \rangle_c$ of the classical system (4) holds verbatim for the computation of the covariance of the BPP observables $\langle \overline{\wp}_{k_1}^{(N)} \overline{\wp}_{k_2}^{(N)} \rangle_c$ of the quantum system (3). In particular, either of the methods of [MŚS07] or [Nov16] (the first of which is based on the combinatorics of annular noncrossing partitions, whereas the second uses the combinatorics of monotone walks on symmetric groups) already developed to estimate the covariance of traces $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(Z_N^{k_1})\,\mathrm{tr}(Z_N^{k_2})] - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(Z_N^{k_1})]\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(Z_N^{k_2})]$ of the classical random Hermitian matrix $Z_N = X_N + Y_N$ in the large N limit applies verbatim to estimate the covariance of traces $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(C_N^{k_1})\,\mathrm{tr}(C_N^{k_2})] - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(C_N^{k_1})]\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}(C_N^{k_2})]$ of the quantum random matrix $C_N = A_N + B_N$. Either option may be selected to furnish a proof of Theorem 1.4 and its corollary, the Law of Large Numbers 1.5.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Benoît Collins was supported by JSPS Kakenhi grants number 26800048 and 15KK0162, and grant number ANR-14-CE25-0003. Piotr Śniady has been supported by *Narodowe Centrum Nauki*, grant number 2014/15/B/ST1/00064. The three authors acknowledge a fruitful working environment at Herstmonceux Castle during the Fields meeting on Quantum Groups and Quantum Information held there in July 2015.

REFERENCES

[AGZ10] G. Anderson, A. Guionnet, and O. Zeitouni. *An Introduction to Random Matrices*, volume 118 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.

[BB96] P. W. Brouwer and C. W. J. Beenaker. Diagrammatic method of integration over the unitary group, with applications to quantum transport in mesoscopic systems. *J. Math. Phys.*, 37:4904–4934, 1996.

[BDW77] G. 't Hooft B. De Wit. Nonconvergence of the $1/n$ expansion for $\mathrm{SU}(n)$ gauge fields on a lattice. *Phys. Lett.*, 69B:61–64, 1977.

[BG15] Alexey Bufetov and Vadim Gorin. Representations of classical Lie groups and quantized free convolution. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 25(25):763–814, 2015.

[Bia95] Philippe Biane. Representations of unitary groups and free convolution. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 31(1):63–79, 1995.

[Bia98] Philippe Biane. Representations of symmetric groups and free probability. *Adv. Math.*, 138(1):126–181, 1998.

[Bia02] P. Biane. Parking functions of types A and B. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 9(1):Note 7, 5 pp. (electronic), 2002.

[Col03] Benoît Collins. Moments and cumulants of polynomial random variables on unitary groups, the Itzykson-Zuber integral, and free probability. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (17):953–982, 2003.

[CŚ06] Benoît Collins and Piotr Śniady. Integration with respect to the Haar measure on unitary, orthogonal and symplectic group. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 264(3):773–795, 2006.

[CŚ09a] Benoît Collins and Piotr Śniady. Asymptotic fluctuations of representations of the unitary groups. Preprint arXiv:0911.5546, 2009.

[CŚ09b] Benoît Collins and Piotr Śniady. Representations of Lie groups and random matrices. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361(6):3269–3287, 2009.

[Ful97] William Fulton. *Young Tableaux*, volume 35 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[GGPN16a] I. P. Goulden, M. Guay-Paquet, and J. Novak. On the convergence of monotone Hurwitz generating functions. *Ann. Comb.*, (To appear), 2016.

[GGPN16b] I. P. Goulden, M. Guay-Paquet, and J. Novak. Toda equations and piecewise polynomiality for mixed double Hurwitz numbers. *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Mehtods Appl.*, (12):1–10, 2016.

[GS82] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg. Geometric quantization and multiplicities of group representations. *Invent. Math.*, 67:515–538, 1982.

[GT93] David J. Gross and Washington Taylor, IV. Two-dimensional QCD is a string theory. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 400(1-3):181–208, 1993.

[Hec82] Gert Heckman. Projections of orbits and and asymptotic behavior of multiplicities for compact connected Lie groups. *Invent. Math.*, 67:515–538, 1982.

[Kir04] A. A. Kirillov. *Lectures on the Orbit Method*, volume 64 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2004.

[KT01] A. Knutson and T. Tao. Honeycombs and sums of hermitian matrices. *Notices of the AMS*, 48:175–186, 2001.

[Kup02] Greg Kuperberg. Random words, quantum statistics, central limits, random matrices. *Methods Appl. Anal.*, 9(1):99–118, 2002.

[MN13] Sho Matsumoto and Jonathan Novak. Jucys-Murphy elements and unitary matrix integrals. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (2):362–397, 2013.

[Mor11] A. Morozov. Unitary integrals and related matrix models. In *The Oxford handbook of random matrix theory*, pages 353–375. Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2011.

[MS16] J. A. Mingo and R. Speicher. *Free Probability and Random Matrices*. Fields Institute Publications, 2016.

[MŚS07] James A. Mingo, Piotr Śniady, and Roland Speicher. Second order freeness and fluctuations of random matrices. II. Unitary random matrices. *Adv. Math.*, 209(1):212–240, 2007.

[Nar06] Hariharan Narayanan. On the complexity of computing Kostka numbers and Littlewood-Richardson coefficients. *J. Algebr. Comb.*, 24:347–354, 2006.

[Nov10] Jonathan I. Novak. Jucys-Murphy elements and the unitary Weingarten function. In *Noncommutative harmonic analysis with applications to probability II*, volume 89 of *Banach Center Publ.*, pages 231–235. Polish Acad. Sci. Inst. Math., Warsaw, 2010.

[Nov14] Jonathan Novak. Three lectures on free probability. In *Random matrix theory, interacting particle systems, and integrable systems*, volume 65 of *Math. Sci.*

Res. Inst. Publ., pages 309–383. Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 2014. With illustrations by Michael LaCroix.

[Nov16] Jonathan I. Novak. The Weingarten calculus: a survey. In preparation, 2016.

[NS06] Alexandru Nica and Roland Speicher. *Lectures on the combinatorics of free probability*, volume 335 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[NS11] J. Novak and P. Śniady. What is... a free cumulant? *Not. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 58:300–301, 2011.

[PP67] A. M. Perelomov and V. S. Popov. Casimir operators for the classical groups. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 174:287–290, 1967.

[Sam80] Stuart Samuel. $\mathrm{U}(N)$ integrals, $1/N$, and the De Wit-'t Hooft anomalies. *J. Math. Phys.*, 21(12):2695–2703, 1980.

[Shl05] Dimitri Shlyakhtenko. Notes on free probability. arXiv preprint math/0504063, 2005.

[Sta97] Richard P. Stanley. Parking functions and noncrossing partitions. *Electron J. Combinat.*, 45:#R20, 1997.

[Tao12] Terence Tao. *Topics in random matrix theory*, volume 132 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.

[VDN92] D. V. Voiculescu, K. J. Dykema, and A. Nica. *Free random variables*, volume 1 of *CRM Monograph Series*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1992. A noncommutative probability approach to free products with applications to random matrices, operator algebras and harmonic analysis on free groups.

[Voi91] Dan Voiculescu. Limit laws for random matrices and free products. *Invent. Math.*, 104(1):201–220, 1991.

[Wey97] Hermann Weyl. *The classical groups*. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997. Their invariants and representations, Fifteenth printing, Princeton Paperbacks.

[Xu97] F. Xu. A random matrix model from two-dimensional Yang-Mills theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 190(2):287–307, 1997.

[Žel73] D. P. Želobenko. *Compact Lie groups and their representations*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1973. Translated from the Russian by Israel Program for Scientific Translations, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 40.

APPENDIX A. FREE PROBABILITY BASICS

Here we briefly outline the basic notions from noncommutative probability theory which are used in the body of the paper. This is far from a complete treatment; further references are the texts [VDN92, MS16, NS06, Tao12], the lecture notes [Nov14, Shl05], and the brief précis [NS11].

A *noncommutative probability space* is a pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathbb{E})$ consisting of a unital, associative $\mathbb{C}$-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ together with a unital linear functional $\mathbb{E}\colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}$. The elements of $\mathcal{A}$ are to be thought of as complex-valued random variables on some underlying Kolmogorov triple $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, with $\mathbb{E}$ playing the role of expectation with respect to the probability measure $\mathbb{P}$. Of course,

since $\mathcal{A}$ is allowed to be noncommutative, such a triple may not exist. Elements of $\mathcal{A}$ are *quantum random variables*.

Given a random variable $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the *distribution* of $\mathcal{A}$ is the moment sequence of A:

$$\mathbb{E}(A^p), \quad p \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$

Given a pair A, B of quantum random variables in $\mathcal{A}$, their *joint distribution* is the data set

$$\mathbb{E}(A^{p(1)}B^{q(1)} \cdots A^{p(d)}B^{q(d)}), \quad d \in \mathbb{N}^*,\ p, q\colon [d] \to \mathbb{N}$$

obtained by evaluating $\mathbb{E}$ on all words in A and B. These expectations are called the *mixed moments* of A and B.

In the context of noncommutative probability, it is reasonable to consider A, B to be *independent* if there is a universal rule for computing their joint distribution from knowledge of their individual distributions ("universal" means that this rule does not depend on the individual distributions of A and B). One such rule comes to us from classical probability: A and B are said to be *classically independent* if they commute, and $\mathbb{E}(A^pB^q) = \mathbb{E}(A^p)\mathbb{E}(B^q)$ for any $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$. In this case, one has

$$\mathbb{E}(A^{p(1)}B^{q(1)} \cdots A^{p(d)}B^{q(d)}) = \mathbb{E}(A^{|p|})\mathbb{E}(B^{|q|}),$$

for any mixed moment, where $|p|$ is the ℓ^1-norm of p and $|q|$ is the ℓ^1-norm of q.

A second universal independence rule for quantum random variables, which is truly noncommutative in nature, was discovered by Voiculescu [Voi91]. It is substantially modelled on free products, and is substantially more complicated than classical independence, which is modelled on tensor products. It is a theorem of Speicher that classical independence and free independence are the *only* universal independence rules for quantum random variables.

In the case when $\mathbb{E}$ is a trace, free independence may be formulated as follows. For each positive integer $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and each permutation $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_d$, define a d-linear functional

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi\colon \underbrace{\mathcal{A} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}}_{d \text{ factors}} \to \mathbb{C}$$

using the cycle structure of π in the most natural way. For example, if $d = 6$ and $\pi = (1\ 4\ 2)(3\ 6)(5)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6) = \mathbb{E}(X_1X_4X_2)\mathbb{E}(X_3X_6)\mathbb{E}(X_5).$$

Observe that $\mathbb{E}_\pi$ is well-defined because $\mathbb{E}$ is a trace. The quantum random variables A, B are *freely independent* if their mixed moments decompose

into pure moments according to the rule

$$\mathbb{E}(A^{p(1)}B^{q(1)}\cdots A^{p(d)}B^{q(d)}) = \sum_{\substack{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2\\ \mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma)=0}} (-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}\vec{W}_0(\alpha,\beta)\mathbf{P}_\alpha(A)\mathbf{P}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(B),$$

where

$$\mathbf{P}_\alpha(A) = \mathbb{E}_\alpha(A^{p(1)},\ldots,A^{p(d)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(B) = \mathbb{E}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(B^{q(1)},\ldots,B^{q(d)})$$

and $(-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}\vec{W}_0(\alpha,\beta)$ is the leading order of the Weingarten function, i.e. $\vec{W}_0(\alpha,\beta)$ is the number of monotone geodesic paths from α to β in $\mathfrak{S}_d$, as in (22).

With the notions of classical and free independence for quantum random variables in place, we can formulate their asymptotic versions. Let $(\mathcal{A}_N,\mathbb{E})$, $N\in\mathbb{N}^*$, be a sequence of noncommutative probability spaces. For each $N\in\mathbb{N}^*$, let A_N and B_N be a pair of quantum random variables in $\mathcal{A}_N$. Assume that the limits

$$x_p = \lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}(A_N^p) \quad \text{and} \quad y_q = \lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}(B_N^q)$$

exist for each fixed $p,q\in\mathbb{N}^*$. Select an arbitrary but fixed positive integer $d\in\mathbb{N}^*$, and an arbitrary but fixed pair of functions $p,q\colon[d]\to\mathbb{N}$, and let

$$\tau_N := \mathbb{E}(A_N^{p(1)}B_N^{q(1)}\cdots A_N^{p(d)}B_N^{q(d)})$$

be the corresponding mixed moment of A_N and B_N. The quantum random variables A_N, B_N are said to be *asymptotically classically independent* if

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\tau_N = x_{|p|}y_{|q|},$$

and *asymptotically freely independent* if

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\tau_N = \sum_{\substack{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{S}_d^2\\ \mathrm{genus}(\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta,\beta^{-1}\gamma)=0}} (-1)^{|\alpha^{-1}\beta|}\vec{W}_0(\alpha,\beta)\mathbf{P}_\alpha(A)\mathbf{P}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(B),$$

where

$$\mathbf{P}_\alpha(A) = \lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_\alpha(A_N^{p(1)},\ldots,A_N^{p(d)})$$
$$\mathbf{P}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(B) = \lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_{\beta^{-1}\gamma}(B_N^{q(1)},\ldots,B_N^{q(d)}).$$

APPENDIX B. CORRECTED PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.4

Regretfully, the proof of Proposition 2.4 presented by Biane [Bia98, Proposition 8.5, part (3)] is not completely correct. That proof was based on a commutation relation [Bia98, top formula on page 166] fulfilled by the entries of the powers of the matrix Z_N; a commutation relation which with our notations would take the form

$$[(Z_N^m)_{ij}, (Z_N^n)_{kl}] = \hbar_N \left[\delta_{jk} \, (Z_N^{m+n-1})_{il} - \delta_{li} \, (Z_N^{m+n-1})_{kj}\right]. \tag{24}$$

This commutation relation *does not* hold true in general — in fact, it fails unless one of the exponents m, n is equal to 1. Here we provide an erratum to the work of Biane [Bia98] which explains how to modify his proof in order to avoid using false statement (24).

Our strategy is to revisit the paper of Biane [Bia98, Sections 8.3 and 8.5] under an additional restriction that we constrain ourselves to the exponents $m = n = 1$ in (24). With Biane's notations this corresponds to abandoning completely the more general Casimir operators $C_\sigma^{(\mathbf{p})}$, except for the trivial case when $\mathbf{p} = (1, \ldots, 1)$ and $C_\sigma^{(\mathbf{p})} = C_\sigma$.

We start with [Bia98, Lemma 8.3]: part (1) of this lemma remains valid but irrelevant for our purposes since it would introduce forbidden Casimir operators $C_\sigma^{(\mathbf{p})}$ with $\mathbf{p} \neq (1, \ldots, 1)$. Part (2) and part (3) of this lemma remain valid; in our restricted context $\mathbf{p} = (1, \ldots, 1)$ they take the form

$$\begin{aligned} C_\sigma - C_{\epsilon\sigma\epsilon^{-1}} &= C_{\sigma'} - N \, C_{\sigma''}, \\ C_\sigma - C_{\epsilon\sigma\epsilon^{-1}} &= C_{\sigma'} - \, C_{\sigma''}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively.

We proceed to [Bia98, Proposition 8.5, part (3)]. Biane's proof is essentially an observation that each permutation σ can be transformed into some canonical permutation (19) by a sequence of conjugations by Coxeter transpositions $\epsilon = (r \; r+1)$ *and, additionally,* we require that after each conjugation the antiexceedance does not increase; Biane, in fact, gives an algorithmic construction of this sequence of transpositions. Each two neighboring permutations in our sequence of permutations are related to each other by a relationship given by [Bia98, Lemma 8.3, part (2) or (3)] which remains valid in our context. Since the antiexceedances of the permutations in our sequence are weakly decreasing, we can bound the error terms given by right-hand sides of [Bia98, Lemma 8.3, part (2) or (3)] in the same way as in the original proof of Biane by an induction hypothesis.

APPENDIX C. BPP MATRICES AND GEOMETRIC QUANTIZATION

As mentioned in the Introduction, BPP matrices quantize independent unitarily invariant random Hermitian matrices with deterministic eigenvalues. This statement falls under the broad umbrella of *geometric quantization*, in the sense of Kirillov and Kostant, see e.g. [Kir04]. In this section, we give a self-contained, physically motivated treatment of this quantization, specific to our setting. The Reader who is not interested in physical arguments may skip this section entirely.

C.1. **Toy example.** We begin by considering a toy example: a physical system consisting of a single stationary particle with an angular momentum. For an alternative (but related) exposition of this example see the work of Kuperberg [Kup02]. We will use the corresponding symmetry group $\mathrm{Spin}(3) \cong \mathrm{SU}(2)$ as a starting point for exploration of the unitary group $\mathrm{U}(N)$ and related algebraic and probabilistic objects.

The traditional way to view the angular momentum in Newtonian mechanics is to regard it as a vector $\vec{J} = (J_x, J_y, J_z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. However, for our purposes it will be more convenient to view the angular momentum as a *functional on the Lie algebra* of the special orthogonal group $\mathrm{SO}(3)$, that is as an element of $\big(\mathfrak{so}(3)\big)^\star$. This functional J is defined as follows. For a given $x \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ we denote by $J(x)$ Noether's invariant corresponding to the one-dimensional Lie group $\mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto e^{tx} \in \mathrm{SO}(3)$ of rotations. Since the map $x \mapsto J(x)$ is linear, it defines an element of the dual space.

From a conceptual point of view, regarding angular momentum as an element of $\big(\mathfrak{so}(3)\big)^\star$ is advantageous; for example it scales nicely to other choices of the dimension of the physical space than 3. Unfortunately, the mathematical vocabulary concerning this dual space is rather limited, and hence it will be convenient to have a more concrete alternative available. For this reason in the following we shall describe the dual of $\mathfrak{so}(3) \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$ in more detail.

C.2. **The dual space.** In greater generality, we are interested in the dual of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(N)$ of traceless antihermitian matrices, as well as the dual of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(N)$ of general antihermitian matrices.

Each of these Lie algebras can be equipped with the symmetric, nondegenerate, bilinear form

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \operatorname{Tr} x^T y. \tag{25}$$

In this way $\big(\mathfrak{su}(N)\big)^* \cong \mathfrak{su}(N)$ and $\big(\mathfrak{u}(N)\big)^* \cong \mathfrak{u}(N)$. Thanks to these isomorphisms, it makes sense to speak about the *eigenvalues* of elements of the dual spaces $\big(\mathfrak{su}(N)\big)^*$ and $\big(\mathfrak{u}(N)\big)^*$.

In the latter case, this isomorphism takes the following more concrete form. Since the complexification $\mathfrak{u}(N) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C} = \mathfrak{gl}(N) = \mathrm{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C})$ has a matrix structure, it follows that $\mathfrak{u}(N)^\star \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C} \cong \mathfrak{u}(N) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C} = \mathrm{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C})$ can be also identified with matrices. More specifically, a functional $x \in \mathfrak{u}(N)^\star \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$ corresponds to the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} x(e_{11}) & \dots & x(e_{N1}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x(e_{1N}) & \dots & x(e_{NN}) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{k,l} x(e_{kl})\, e_{kl} \in \mathrm{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}), \tag{26}$$

where $e_{kl} \in \mathrm{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{u}(N) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$ are the standard matrix units. Indeed, the above matrix defines via (25) a functional which on a matrix unit e_{ij} takes the same value as the functional x.

Note the subtlety in the formulation of (26): since e_{kl} is not an antihermitian matrix, for $x \in \mathfrak{u}(N)^\star$ the quantity $x(e_{kl})$ might be not well defined. Nevertheless, $x(e_{kl})$ may be defined thanks to the observation that $e_{kl} \in \mathrm{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{u}(N) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$ belongs to the *complexification of antihermitian matrices*, thus we may extend the domain of x by linearity as follows:

$$x(e_{kl}) = x\left(i\frac{e_{kl}+e_{lk}}{2i} + \frac{e_{kl}-e_{lk}}{2}\right) := ix\left(\frac{e_{kl}+e_{lk}}{2i}\right) + x\left(\frac{e_{kl}-e_{lk}}{2}\right).$$

C.3. **Back to the angular momentum.** Suppose that for some physical Newtonian system its angular momentum — viewed as a vector $\vec{J} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ — is random, with the uniform distribution on the sphere with radius $|J|$. One can show that this corresponds to J being *a random element of the dual space* $\big(\mathfrak{su}(2)\big)^*$*, uniformly random on the manifold of antihermitian matrices with specified eigenvalues* $\pm i\,|J|$.

In other words, under the isomorphism from Appendix C.2 the distribution of the angular momentum coincides with the distribution of the random matrix

$$U \begin{bmatrix} i\,|J| & \\ & -i\,|J| \end{bmatrix} U^{-1}, \tag{27}$$

where $U \in \mathrm{SU}(2)$ is a random matrix from the special unitary group, distributed according to the Haar measure. We now describe a quantum analogue of this probability distribution.

C.4. **Angular momentum in quantum mechanics.** We consider the following quantum analogue of the Newtonian system considered above: a quantum particle with fixed spin $j\hbar$, where $j \in \big\{0, 1/2, 1, 3/2, \dots\big\}$ and $\hbar$ denotes the Planck constant. Such a particle is described by a Hilbert space $\mathbf{V}$, this space being the appropriate unitary representation $\alpha\colon \mathrm{Spin}(3) \to \mathrm{GL}(\mathbf{V})$. The Lie group $\mathrm{Spin}(3) \cong \mathrm{SU}(2)$ is the universal cover of the group

$\mathrm{SO}(3)$ describing rotations of the physical space. To be more specific, α is the irreducible representation of the Lie group $\mathrm{SU}(2)$ with the dimension $2j+1 \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$.

In order to sustain the concordance with the Newtonian situation discussed above, the angular momentum should be a functional

$$J \colon \mathfrak{so}(3) \to \operatorname{End} \mathbf{V}$$

which to an element of the Lie algebra $x \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ associates the infinitesimal *Hermitian* generator of the action of the one-parameter Lie group $\mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto e^{tx} \in \mathrm{Spin}(3)$ on its representation $\mathbf{V}$, i.e.

$$\alpha\left(e^{tx}\right) = e^{-it\frac{J(x)}{\hbar}}.$$

The choice of normalization on the right hand side comes from the notations used in quantum mechanics. Clearly, this means that (up to a scalar multiple) the angular momentum

$$-i\frac{J}{\hbar} = \alpha \colon \mathfrak{so}(3) \to \operatorname{End} \mathbf{V}$$

is a representation of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(3) = \mathfrak{su}(2)$. If $\operatorname{End} \mathbf{V}$ is viewed as an algebra of noncommutative random variables,

$$-i\frac{J}{\hbar} = \alpha \in \left(\mathfrak{so}(3)\right)^* \otimes \operatorname{End} \mathbf{V}$$

becomes a *quantum random element of the dual space* $\left(\mathfrak{so}(3)\right)^* = \left(\mathfrak{su}(2)\right)^*$.

Just as before we assume that we have no further information about the particle; in other words, the quantum system is in the maximally mixed state and thus the algebra $\operatorname{End} \mathbf{V}$ of noncommutative random variables is equipped with the state $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathbf{V}}$. Just as before, it is convenient to have a concrete matrix representation from Appendix C.2 for the elements of the dual space $\left(\mathfrak{su}(2)\right)^*$. We shall discuss this concrete representation now.

C.5. **The dual space.** Consider a slightly more general situation in which $\alpha \colon \mathfrak{u}(N) \to \operatorname{End} \mathbf{V}$ is a representation of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(N)$.

Equation (26) shows that $-i\frac{J}{\hbar} = \alpha$ can be identified with the matrix

$$-i\frac{J}{\hbar} = \alpha = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha(e_{11}) & \dots & \alpha(e_{N1}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \alpha(e_{1N}) & \dots & \alpha(e_{NN}) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{28}$$

C.6. **Conclusion.** The above considerations show that from a physicist's point of view, for $N = 2$ the 2×2 matrix (28) is a natural quantization of the random matrix (27) which describes the angular momentum in Newtonian mechanics.

It is time to detach from the physical toy example related to the group $\mathrm{Spin}(3) \cong \mathrm{SU}(2)$ and consider the general situation treated in this article. The *classical object* which we considered in this section was a random element of $\big(\mathfrak{u}(N)\big)^*$ (or, a random antihermitian matrix), sampled uniformly from the elements with specified spectrum. Its *quantization* is a BPP matrix: a quantum random element of $\big(\mathfrak{u}(N)\big)^*$ which corresponds to a specified irreducible representation of $\mathrm{U}(N)$.

C.7. **Choice of the matrix structure on $\mathfrak{u}(N)^\star$.** Unlike in the case of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(N)$, there is no canonical choice of matrix structure on the dual $\mathfrak{u}(N)^\star$. In Appendix C.2 this structure was chosen based on the bilinear form $\langle A, B\rangle = \operatorname{Tr} A^T B$. One can argue however, that the bilinear form $\langle A, B\rangle = \operatorname{Tr} AB$ would be equally natural. With respect to this new convention, the representation α viewed as a matrix becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha(e_{11}) & \dots & \alpha(e_{1N}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \alpha(e_{N1}) & \dots & \alpha(e_{NN}) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{Mat}_N(\operatorname{End}\mathbf{V}) = \mathrm{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \operatorname{End}\mathbf{V}, \tag{29}$$

which is *not* a BPP matrix. The matrices (28) and (29) differ only by transposition with respect to the first factor of the tensor product $\mathrm{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \operatorname{End}\mathbf{V}$, an operation known as *partial transposition*. The minor advantage of the notation (28) is that it coincides with the notation of Želobenko [Žel73] who calculated the spectral measure of BPP matrices.

There are, however, no serious advantages of one notation over the other, since the calculation of the spectral measure of (29) can be done by the analogous methods to those of Želobenko [Žel73]. The only difference is that

instead of considering the tensor product with the canonical representation, one should consider the tensor product with the contragradient one.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN
CNRS, FRANCE
E-mail address: collins@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UC SAN DIEGO, 9500 GILMAN DRIVE, LA JOLLA CA 92093-0112, USA
E-mail address: jinovak@ucsd.edu

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, UL. ŚNIADECKICH 8, 00-956 WARSZAWA, POLAND
E-mail address: psniady@impan.pl